

The University of Chicago

THE ATTITUDE OF EUROPEAN
STATES TOWARD EMIGRATION TO
THE AMERICAN COLONIES AND
THE UNITED STATES, 1607-1820

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

1937

By

JOHN DUNCAN BRITE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

The University of Chicago

THE ATTITUDE OF EUROPEAN
STATES TOWARD EMIGRATION TO
THE AMERICAN COLONIES AND
THE UNITED STATES, 1607-1820

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

1937

By

JOHN DUNCAN BRITE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939



Prefatory Note

The chapters reproduced herewith as the "essential portion" of the doctoral dissertation of John Duncan Brite contain footnote references to other parts which are to be found in the complete dissertation, which is on file only in the University of Chicago Libraries.

CHAPTER IV

PROMOTION AGENTS AND THEIR ACTIVITIES

The actual enlistment of the emigrant and the making of the arrangements for his journey to America were usually effected by promotion agents of various kinds. Their authority came from landed proprietors, colonization companies, governments, religious groups, colonial legislatures, and other sources. An agent might have been a proprietor himself or the representative of another agent. On the other hand, he might have been promoting emigration purely for personal profit, and without authority from anyone else.

In many cases patroons and proprietors were their own promoters. They obtained from governments or trading companies the requisite authority to transport themselves and persons engaged by them to the plantations. Jochem Pietersz Kuyter, Cornelis Melyn, and Jonas Bronck were of this type, transporting themselves with permission of the Assembly of the Nineteen of the Dutch West India Company to New Netherland in 1639.¹ Bronck advanced funds for certain Danes brought with him who were to work on his lands.² Van Rensselaer sent colonists at different times to Rensselaerswyck. He contracted for some of them with agents in Norway, and made individual agreements with his emigrants, though many broke

¹The power of the Dutch West India Company was vested in five chambers of managers, located in the different provinces of Holland. These chambers sent delegates to the Assembly of the XIX, in which the executive powers of the company were vested by the States General under the charter of June 3, 1621. The Chamber of Amsterdam, managing four ninth parts of the company, sent eight of the nineteen delegates. See Article XI, XVIII, and XIX of the charter in Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan, History of New Netherland (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1848), I, 401, 402-03.

²E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Co., 1853-97), I, 250-51, XIII, 5; John O. Evjen, Scandinavian Immigrants in New York, 1630-74 (Minneapolis: K. C. Holter Publishing Co., 1916), pp. 237-45, 156, 171, 173. (The former is hereafter cited as N. Y. Col. Docs.)

their promises upon arrival in America.¹ He also asked his representatives in the Netherlands to look for good farm laborers for him, and employed Adriaen Van der Donck of Breda to contract for several workers needed in his colony.² Even ministers were his agents, and persons emigrating were offered monopolies in certain trades for a period of six years.³ Patroon Henrick van der Capelle similarly sent about ninety persons, in addition to soldiers, to his colony in New Amsterdam by 1655.⁴ Huguenot refugee merchants settled plantations in Oxford, Massachusetts, with emigrants and servants hired by them at their own expense.⁵

William Penn encouraged Quakers, Pietists, and others to emigrate to Pennsylvania during his three trips into Germany and by his many promotion pamphlets. Among his agents were Benjamin Furly at Rotterdam, who sold his lands in Europe and negotiated the passage of thirteen pioneer families to Pennsylvania in 1683.⁶ Two Anabaptists conducted emigrants by way of Rotterdam to London;⁷ and Jacob Telner, Amsterdam merchant, personally superintended the emigration of the Crefelders who were going to Germantown.⁸ James Claypoole advanced the passage money and financed a

¹A. J. F. Van Laer, Van Rensselaer Bowler Manuscripts (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1908), pp. 486, 483, 545, 546, 612, 614, 615; Knut Gjerset, Norwegian Sailors in American Waters (Northfield, Minnesota: Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1933), p. 56.

²Among his agents were Van der Donck, Jacob Albertsz Planck, and Rev. Johannes Megapolensis. Van Laer, pp. 467, 524, 547, 575, 543, 824.

³Ibid., pp. 604-08.

⁴N. Y. Col. Docs., I, 638.

⁵Charles W. Baird, History of the Huguenot Emigration to America (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1885), II, 168-69, 215-16, 259-69, 290.

⁶Julius F. Sachse, "Benjamin Furly, an English Merchant in Rotterdam," Pennsylvania Magazine of History, XIX (October, 1895), pp. 277-306; J. F. Sachse, The German Pietists of Provincial Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1895), pp. 433-59; Mennonite Year Book (Berne, Indiana), 1915, pp. 32-33.

⁷Das verlangte, nicht erlangte Canaan (Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1711), pp. 94-99, quoted in Daniel Häberle, Auswanderung und Koloniegründung der Pfälzer im 18. Jahrhundert (Kaiserlautern: H. Kayser, 1919), pp. 48-50.

⁸Samuel W. Pennypacker, "The Settlement of Germantown," Pennsylvania German Society, Proceedings, IX, 54-58, 177 (hereafter cited as PGSP).

voyage from London.¹ John Jacob Zimmerman, pastor of the Lutheran Church in the Duchy of Württemberg, asked Furly for permission and assistance to remove sixteen or seventeen families "from these Babilonish Coasts, to those American Plantations, being led thereunto by the guidance of the Divine Spirit."² Daniel Falckner, one of these emigrants, also represented Penn, since he returned in 1698 to secure more enlistments.³ Philip Ford and Robert Ness in London took applications and dispensed instructions regarding the journey.⁴

Where the governments took an active interest in colonization and closely supervised their trading companies it was natural for them to promote emigration to the colonies they were establishing. Thus Sweden not only sent officials to Holland to buy supplies and to hire sailors for her expeditions to New Sweden but also instructed her provincial governors at home to gather emigrants and to hire enlisters to persuade Swedish vagrants to emigrate. It was under such instructions that Sven Skute, Mans Kling, and Johan Printz collected persons in the mining and forest districts of Sweden for the colony between 1640 and 1653. Funds were given them to engage soldiers, laborers, and settlers. Skilled workmen were secured, as well as artisans and farmers.⁵ Even the Swedish Council of State, and the Commercial College which controlled trade and regulated Swedish trading companies, may be looked upon as agents of the government in promoting emigration. In a sense, all Swedish officials were promotion agents,

¹"Extracts from the Letter-Book of James Claypoole," Pennsylvania Magazine of History, X, 272-76.

²Gerhard Croese, General History of the Quakers (London, 1696), II, 262. Quoted by S. W. Pennypacker in PGSP, IX, 264-66.

³Ibid., pp. 282-83.

⁴Some Proposals for a Second Settlement in the Province of Pennsylvania (London, 1690), PGSP, XIV, 246-47.

⁵See chap. viii on the Undesirable Emigrant for the work of such agents. For examples of the instructions given them consult the Commission for Mans Kling, September 26, 1640, in C. T. Odner, "The Founding of New Sweden, 1637-1642," trans. by Gregory B. Keen in Pennsylvania Magazine of History, III, 405; instructions for Sven Skute, 1653, summarized in Amandus Johnson, Swedish Settlements on the Delaware (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1911), II, 471-72. See also E. A. Louhi, The Delaware Finns (New York: The Humanity Press, 1925), pp. 35-39.

as they were all ordered to assist such ventures, which were under direct control of the General Director of the Commerical College and the Chancellor.¹

Jesse de Forest and the Leyden French and Walloon Huguenots enlisted Huguenot families in Holland in 1622-23 with permission of the States General and with consent of the cities in which they were gathered. Some thirty families were collected to be sent to the lands of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland.² Here again the control was similar, regulation by the government of enlistment of persons sent out under the supervision of a trading corporation.

The term "promotion agent" may also be used to refer to a great number of people, who although they did not make a business of enlisting emigrants, were responsible for the departure of others, directly or indirectly. Thus one altruistically aiding others to escape at the time he himself fled may be included.³ Even John Law may be considered a promotion agent if the term be used more widely, for the Company of the Indies is reported to have sent about six thousand French, Italian, German, and Swiss to Louisiana within twenty-five years.⁴

Persons returning from America to visit relatives,⁵ to live, or to remove property were usually indirect agents of emigration, as were soldiers, ministers, and missionaries back from

¹Paragraph based upon Johnson, Swed. Settlements, II, 469-89. See also chap. viii on Undesirables.

²Baird, I, 166 ff.

³Baird, II, 194, n. 1. Francis Gerneaux, wealthy Huguenot merchant, ca. 1685.

⁴Alexander Franz, "Die erste deutsche Einwanderung in das Mississippital," in Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, XII, 194-97, 253 (hereafter referred to as DAG). According to Franz, 7,020 persons went from Europe to Louisiana between 1718 and 1722. He thinks that of the four thousand Germans mentioned in Law's agreement not more than 1,250 reached ports of debarkation before his downfall in 1720. There was no mass emigration of Germans to this colony before 1719.

⁵For examples, A. B. Faust and G. M. Brumbaugh, Lists of Swiss Emigrants in the Eighteenth Century to the American Colonies (Washington: National Genealogical Society, 1920), II, 204, 206, 209.

the colonies. All were suspected by European governments as possible promoters. Those who had never been in America but passed on the good news received from friends or relatives abroad often had great influence on the departure of others,¹ whether they profited financially or not. It was because of the influence of returned persons that Nassau-Dillenburg in 1773 decreed that upon arrival they should ask for permission to enter, state their business in the country, and be allowed only a limited time in which to transact it.²

Ministers going from America to Europe to solicit funds to obtain Bibles and other books, or to secure additional colonial pastors were especially dangerous as they could not be punished under the laws. Yet they encouraged emigration. It was customary to expedite their departure, and in the case of the Swiss at least, to give them hotel and traveling expenses to the border to get rid of them.³ Michael Schlatter, who returned to Europe in 1751 to seek aid for the Reformed Churches in Pennsylvania, was sent into Germany and Switzerland by the Synod of North Holland to secure aid and to seek ministers for Pennsylvania. Whatever influence his writings and sermons may have had upon emigration, he did secure six pastors for Pennsylvania churches, persons who with their families must be considered as emigrants.⁴ Sometimes ministers returned definitely in the roll of emigration agents.⁵ The influence of German Lutheran churchmen in London

¹Niclaus Tschudi and an unknown baker at Rotterdam may illustrate the point. Faust, Lists, II, 169; Mennonite Year Book 1913, p. 35.

²Relation 190, Dillenburg, June 26, 1773. Preuss. Staatsarchiv. Wiesbaden. Bestand VII. Nassau-Dillenburg Landes Regierung. R. 206, Vol. II Pt. II, pp. 242-46 (hereafter referred to as R. 206).

³A. B. Faust, Guide to the Materials for American History in Swiss and Austrian Archives (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1916), pp. 50, 119; A. B. Faust, "Swiss Emigration to the American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century," in Amer. Hist. Rev., XXII (October, 1916), p. 30 (hereafter referred to as AHR).

⁴Rev. Henry Harbaugh, The Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter (Philadelphia, Lindsay and Blakiston, 1857), pp. 76-83.

⁵See, for example, Rev. Jacques Roullaud who returned to France from New York to remove Protestant families, 1671. Victor Hugo Paltsits (ed.), Minutes of the Executive Council of the Province of New York (Albany, 1910), I, 116.

between 1708 and 1764 was also a vital factor in promoting emigration to the English colonies, as these men were German Pietists and interested in their persecuted brethren in the homeland.¹ Ministers were often leaders of bands of colonists,² while others in Germany, through sermons which stressed the hope that God would lead His people out of bondage into the promised land of America did much to promote the emigration movement.³

The emigration of soldiers to America was promoted by agents who enlisted them for colonial service. Some of these soldiers eventually settled as colonists.⁴ By means of favorable reports and by bribery Captain Merveilleux (or Wunderlich) of Neuenberg in 1720 secured two hundred Swiss for service in Mississippi. Entire families of poor consented to go. Even forcible kidnapping was resorted to. Bern offered a reward of thirty thaler for his capture and forbade his recruiting, but without much success.⁵ Others also recruited troops in Bern canton for Louisiana, in 1720, but the Swiss had little desire for service overseas. Though some individuals were forcibly pressed into service for Mississippi in the following years the total was small.⁶

Persecuted religious groups also had their agents. After securing lands from the founder of Bohemia Manor the two Labadists, Peter Sluyter and Jasper Dankers, established a num-

¹For example, Rev. Anton Wilhelm Böhme, Rev. Johann Trebecko; Rev. Gustav Wachscl, Rev. Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen. Julius F. Sachse, "The Lutheran Clergy of London, and How They Aided German Emigration During the XVIII Century," Lutheran Church Review, XXII (1903), pp. 15-17, 314 ff.

²Rev. William J. Hinke (ed.), Life and Letters of the Rev. John Philip Boehm, Founder of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1916), pp. 29, 45, 49, 51, 30.

³Document dated July 12, 1709, Nassau-Dillenburg, in Goebel, DAG, XII, 139.

⁴Of the troops taking part in the Revolution, some 42 per cent did not return to Europe, and of these some 17 per cent are classified as deserters according to Edward J. Lowell, The Hessians (New York: Harper and Bros., 1884), pp. 299-300.

⁵Faust, Guide, pp. 33-34, 41-42, 53-54; Faust, Lists, II, 17.

⁶Faust, Lists, II, 14-17.

ber of their sects in Maryland in 1683.¹ Marquis Olivier de la Muce and Charles de Sailly conducted some seven hundred Waldensians and Vaudois to Manakintown, Virginia, in 1700. They had originally planned to settle them on the lands of one of the Carolina proprietors.² Martin Kendig, Mennonite, was sent to Europe from Conestoga in 1710 to induce a number of Swiss and Germans to settle in Pennsylvania.³ Count Zinzendorf, who was considering Georgia as a place of refuge for the Moravians, also had that colony in mind for the Schwenckfelders of Saxony. He did his best to get the Georgia Trustees and the English minister at Copenhagen interested in helping the latter group to emigrate to Georgia.⁴ The actual agent conducting the Salzburger to Georgia was von Reck.⁵ An American agent, Johann Matthias Kramer, secured Palatines at Rotterdam for the Georgia Trustees through the help of Messrs. Hope and Company.⁶

The best example of the emigration of religious groups and the methods by which it was accomplished is that of the French Huguenots. By their vast and effective "underground railroad," thousands found their way across the French frontiers after 1685. Among the more famous emissaries was the guide Lespine who by 1686 was reported to have made fourteen trips conducting persons from France to Amsterdam. His underground route included a bureau of direction in a village near Paris and correspondents or guides

¹Bartlett B. James, "The Labadists Colony in Maryland," American Society of Church History Papers, VIII (1897), pp. 155-58; Charles P. Mallery, "Ancient Families of Bohemia Manor," Del. Hist. Soc., Historical and Biographical Papers, I, no. 7 (1888), 30-31, 34; James G. Wilson, "Augustine Herrman," New Jersey Hist. Soc., Proceedings, 2d ser., XI (1890), pp. 30-31.

²Baird, II, 176-77.

³E. K. Martin, "The Mennonites," in Mennonite Year Book, 1897, pp. 18-19.

⁴H. W. Kriebel, "The Schwenckfelders in Pennsylvania," PGSP, XIII (1902), pp. 30-31.

⁵Letter from von Reck to the Right Honourable James Vernon, June 28 (July 9), 1737, Allen D. Candler (comp.), The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia (Atlanta, Georgia, 1904--), XXI, 433-34 (hereafter cited as Ge. Col. Records).

⁶Letter of Kramer, dated Rotterdam, June 26, 1737. Ibid., XXI, 422. See also ibid., II, 8, where a petition of two hundred Vaudois to emigrate from Bern to Georgia with the help of Bern and the Trustees indicates that D. Wolters was also an agent at Rotterdam.

in various cities on the way. He knew various routes to Holland which avoided the towns and conducted his emigrants at night from one rendezvous to another, one guide preceding the party and one bringing up the rear.¹ Descriptions have been left to us of many of these agents, some of whom were able, intelligent, and kind. Isai Martin of Meaux conducted about one hundred Huguenots a year to the Hague, changing his costume each trip. The village of Bohain in Picardy was said to be "completely filled with guides."² It was expected that Louis XIV would do everything possible to break up this traffic so profitable to its conductors. Such individuals were arrested, and where proof of guilt was lacking, detained in places specified by the government.³ In May of 1686 condemnations to the galleys was made the punishment for conducting Huguenots beyond the frontiers. This was not sufficient to check the movement so a declaration of October 12, 1687, specified that those aiding such emigration, either directly or indirectly, were to be punished with death.⁴ Such legislation proved of little avail. We find Captain Philip Dumares taking a considerable number of Huguenots from the Channel islands to America in the latter part of the century and himself settling in Boston in 1716.⁵

Aside from legislation against the Huguenots, there was no general restriction or control of emigration agents until mass departure began in the eighteenth century. The restrictive legislation of Bern, Zurich, Basel, and other Swiss cantons was caused by the work of many agents who in the 1730's were enlisting emigrants for Carolina. New Bern, North Carolina, had been founded in 1710 by Christoph von Graffenried and Purrysburg,

¹An interesting picture of this man's activities is given in a report made to the Lieutenant-General of Police, in O. Douen, La Revocation de l'Édit de Nantes à Paris (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1894), II, 455-58.

²Ibid., pp. 455, 438, 463-64, 475.

³G. B. Depping, Correspondance administrative sous le règne de Louis XIV (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855), IV, 398, 410; Douen, II, 460, 471, 472. These orders for arrests of guides give interesting pictures of various agents.

⁴Édits Déclarations et Arrests concernant La Religion P. Réformée, 1662-1751 (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1885), pp. 300-01.

⁵Baird, II, 193.

South Carolina, in 1732 by Jean Pierre Purry of Neuchâtel. The latter issued pamphlets and posters which became very effective about 1730.¹ The gunmaker, Hans Georg Stryger (Striker) of Steffisburg, had lists of those anxious to emigrate. He collected advance payments from them, and was the leader of the 322 persons to whom Bern gave permission to depart on March 2, 1735.² The goldsmith, Sulzer, and Pastor Heinrich Götschi, both of Zurich,³ and Captain Quinche, Maitre des Clefs in Neuchâtel, succeeded in influencing various Bernese citizens to leave.⁴ We have no proof that these and other agents then in the cantons were agents of Purry, or were even working together. Their activities, however, were concerned with emigration to the Carolinas, and they were arrested and punished when evidence could be found against them. They were also forced to return any sums paid to them by emigrants, were deprived of promotion letters and other propaganda, and were banished from Zurich and Bern cantons. Zurich went further and forbade all emigration to Carolina.⁵ Such legislation against these agents was unsuccessful, as the activities of minor agents between the time of Purry and Peter Huber indicates.⁶

¹For Purry's literature of emigration, see B. R. Carroll (comp.), Historical Collections of South Carolina (New York: Harper and Bros., 1836), II, 121-40. For Purry's activities, see A. B. Faust, "Documents in Swiss Archives relating to Emigration to the American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century," in AHR, XXII (Oct. 1916), pp. 131-32; Faust, AHR, XXII, 25-26; Faust, Guide, pp. 42-43, 57, 38, 169; Faust, Lists, II, 76.

²Faust, Guide, pp. 43-46; Faust, Lists, II, 18, 20, 89, 94. He was in Germantown in 1736.

³Faust, Guide, p. 31; Faust, Lists, I, 22, 23, 61.

⁴Faust, Guide, pp. 45, 54. For minor agents, ibid., p. 21.

⁵Zurich decrees of November 3, 1734, and January 29, 1735, are given in full in Faust, Guide, pp. 15-16. For Bern, ibid., p. 35.

⁶That is, between 1735 and 1742. Among them are Sebastian Zuberbühler who enlisted fifty or more families at Zurich; Hans Spring at Basel and Bern; Hans Riemensperger from Toggenburg; Bersinger; Sterchi of Zollbrück; Jacob Border; and the shoemaker, Jacob Frauenfelder, of Zurich canton. Hans Riemensperger pledged himself to transport a hundred families for Carolina and Georgia; fifty thalers were offered for his arrest by Bern in 1741 and he was finally banished from the canton. Frauenfelder induced thirty-two persons to emigrate from Henkartt parish, Zurich canton, in 1743. Faust, Guide, passim, but especially pp. 35, 38, 46, 55; Faust, Lists, II, 109; Faust AHR, XXII, 106, 126.

In 1742 Peter Huber, thirty-six year old shoemaker of Oberhasli, returned to Switzerland from Carolina to take his wife and children to America. Suspected by the canton of Bern of enticing some twenty families of the Oberland, or mountain districts, to emigrate, he was arrested and examined at Basel and turned over to Bern, where he was subjected to two examinations. He admitted that there were persons in the cantons who wished to leave, but denied putting the idea into their heads. He said nothing of Carolina unless asked and then had presented both favorable and unfavorable view but said that he advised nobody to go on account of the long and difficult voyage. In speaking of good wages and cheap living in Carolina he insisted he had told only the truth. He denied having influenced people to go or having accepted money from them, save in the case of Barbara Horger whose relatives had already emigrated and whom he thought could emigrate under the old law of the canton.¹ Attempts to get emigrants to testify against him failed; those firmly resolved to leave were careful to exonerate him of blame; one deciding to remain threw the blame for enticement upon him, but the motives for emigration were complex enough to allow the stressing of any one cause of departure without departing very far from the truth. The trial indicates clearly that the final factor in the emigration of these people was Huber himself, though it was not until shortly before his second examination, when he threw from his prison window a paper on which he urged those desiring to go with him to meet him in Neuenburg some time later, that evidence was at hand to induce him to confess. He was subsequently banished from the canton. However, the testimony two years later of Inäbnit, another famous Swiss agent, indicated that he succeeded in reaching Carolina with a number of emigrants.²

Peter Inäbnit was twice examined by Bern in 1744 for enticing people to Carolina. He claimed that he had returned to Switzerland to live and denied that he was influencing people to depart. Later he stated he had written a letter to the English ambassador, at the request of several people, asking for aid in the transport of two hundred persons to Carolina,--a letter which he had not intended to send as he knew the English would be

¹Faust, AHR, XXII, 103. What this law was is not stated.

²Ibid., 98-106, 34, 36; Faust, Guide, pp. 35-39, 46-47, 55-56.

unwilling to violate Swiss laws. He admitted carrying eight letters, but denied knowledge of their contents. He asserted that he had answered questions about America, but neither praised nor blamed the country, and in no case had influenced anyone to emigrate. Subjecting him to the rack did not change his testimony, and he was banished from Bern. He was later rearrested at Basel upon information contained in a confiscated letter written by agent Philipp Friedrich Wild, Rotterdam innkeeper and American ship-owner, and accused of enticing about seventy families to emigrate. Inäbnit finally admitted that he had written certain persons on how to prepare for a journey to Carolina, believing he was doing no wrong since he was banished from Bern canton anyway. He had written to various people for travel money for them; had invited a cousin to go to England with him to visit a relative; and also had asked Philipp Wild about costs of the voyage to America for a subject of Untersee. His guilt was clearly proven, and only his death from a fall in an attempt to escape from prison prevented further penalties being placed on him by Bern.¹

Sometimes agents were active in their home communities for several years before they and others emigrated. To check these minor agents as well as to banish the major ones Bern and Basel ordered that agents be arrested as soon as suspected. They offered rewards for their discovery, and warned would-be emigrants not to give passage money to such promoters.² The law of Schaffhausen of January 25, 1751, against the sheltering of returned colonists was probably aimed as much at emigrants who were dissatisfied with America.³ In the same year Bern forbade all emigration to New Scotland and offered a reward of one hundred thalers for the seizure of seducers and enticers.⁴

¹Staatsarchiv, Bern. Klein Thurn-Buch, 1743-44, pp. 132-49, 153-60, 206-15. This record of examination of prisoners confined in the tower, or Thurn, is given for In Aebnit (Im Äbnit, Imäbnit, In Aebnit, etc.) in Faust, AHR, XXII, 108-14, part of which is translated into English by him in ibid., pp. 36-39. See also Faust, Guide, pp. 47-48, 56, 57.

²Among such people were Hans Jacob Walter (or Walder) of Knonau; Heinrich Keller, young schoolmaster of Hüntwangen; the shop-keeper Bersinger of Weyach; and Jacob Dürrenberger of Lupsinger. Basel decrees of March 12 and August 13, 1749; the latter decree against agents was renewed on March 25, 1771. Faust, Guide, pp. 22, 39, 48, 105, 109, 111; Faust, Lists, I, 99; II, 60.

³Faust, Guide, p. 123.

⁴Ibid., p. 36.

Probably the most famous Swiss agent of the century was Jacob Joner, a short, little man with dark eyes, dark curly hair; a large broad nose, and a big upturned mouth. Sporting a silk neckcloth, Hamburg stockings, city shoes, a cane, and a "couteau," he was the picture of the typical newlander or werber.¹ As both a property and an emigration agent² we find him in Switzerland for four successive years beginning in 1749. The agents Heinrich Spenhauer, Werner Stohler, and Hans Adam Riggenbacher, were also securing emigrants and withdrawing property for American claimants.³ In 1749, Spenhauer and Joner were ordered to leave Basel within forty-eight hours and the expulsion of Stohler was similarly ordered.⁴ Because of suspicion against him, Riggenbacher, who is portrayed as a harmless and timid young man, was forced to stay in Holland and Germany in 1749 and again upon his second visit a year later.⁵ On March 22, 1749, Basel decided to let all those emigrate who had applied for permission up to that time,-- 382 persons with their families,--"in order that they might see how foolishly they had acted."⁶ They were to lose their land-right and inheritance, pay their taxes, and never return to the canton. When Basel on March 29 discontinued the granting of permission to depart, some still wanted to go. Following the subsequent attempts of Joner and Spänhauer to enlist people in Bern in May, for which Bern ordered their arrest, four ships went down the Rhine under Joner's care to the port of embarkation.⁷

¹Faust, Lists, II, 101-02. See also the interesting description of the newlander, Johannes Tschudi of Frenkendorf, ibid., p. 162.

²Property agents were individuals sent to Europe to withdraw inheritances and other property for American claimants. See chap. ix.

³Albert B. Faust, "Unpublished Documents on Emigration from the Archives of Switzerland" in DAG, XVIII, 21 ff. See also chap. ix.

⁴Faust, Lists, II, 130, 121, 135; Faust, Guide, p. 105.

⁵Faust, Lists, II, 127.

⁶Quotation from Basel archive records by Faust. Ibid., p. 136.

⁷Ibid., p. 136; Faust, Guide, p. 48. Joner admitted in his trial in 1750 that about three hundred left with him on the four ships. See Faust, DAG, XVIII, 22 f.

In 1750 Joner was in Switzerland for the second time to remove inheritances, merchandise, and other wares to Pennsylvania. As he had been ordered not to return, his enlistments were secret. Arrested again by Basel and tried before the Seven Lords, or police court, he was ordered to leave the country within twenty-four hours.¹ In 1751 his activities caused Basel to offer a reward of four new thalers for his arrest. Bern, rejecting his power of attorney to withdraw property, banished him as a suspected werber. In June, she expelled Johannes Tschudi and Bratteler as well.²

The refusal of Bern and Basel to release further inheritances to Joner, plus the loss by robbery of the vessel on which he was conducting emigrants to Holland, destroyed his usefulness as an agent.³ Johannes Tschudi continued his activities without either Basel or Bern being able to bring about his punishment. Not until 1767 was Basel able to arrest Tschudi, exclude him from inheritance claims, and banish him from the canton. Despite all this he was able to secure his inheritance and to transact business through the intercession of the British ambassador in Bern.⁴

By the middle of the eighteenth century the enlisting of emigrants had taken on its characteristic form with all its evils. The so-called "men-thieves," "soul-sellers," "newlanders," and "werbers," were active throughout the Rhinelands. There is reason for suspecting that in 1734 some of those befriending the Schwenkfelders and aiding them on their journey from Berthelsdorf to Rotterdam were soul-sellers, for passage money was given those who could have paid their own. Moreover, the captain of the vessel on which they sailed was a notorious newlander. A guard was stationed outside their lodgings at Haarlem supposedly to keep

¹Faust, DAG, XVIII, 22-26; Faust, Lists, II, 158-62; Faust, Guide, pp. 112, 106. Tschudi acted as a go-between for Joner and various emigrants in 1750.

²Faust, Guide, 106, 49. Basel order of March 10, 1751; Bern action of March 27, May 24, and June 26, 1751.

³Faust, Lists, II, 101-02.

⁴Ibid., passim; Faust, Guide, pp. 106, 112, 113. Various relatives were induced by him to emigrate. Eight Tschudis left in 1749, three in 1750, five in addition to Johannes in 1751, and some fifteen in 1767.

others out, but more likely to keep them in.¹ This latter practice was a typical newlander custom to prevent the escape of freights,² and hence of profits. Such agents frequently claimed to have powers of attorney to withdraw inheritances, which made it difficult to tell whether the soul-seller was a property agent, promotion agent, or both. Sometimes they influenced old people to emigrate first, in the hope that their relatives would follow.³ Promotion agents were often: (1) business men returned from America who proposed to take merchandise back with them; (2) persons going back home to visit; or (3) persons going deliberately to enlist others. The best agent was always one who had been in America.

The system of private agents and enlists in Germany in the early 1750's was rather widespread. It centered around several American agents who were either deputed by the Lord Commissioners of Trade and Plantations as was Mr. John Dick for Nova Scotia, or by provincial governments as was Joseph Crellius for Massachusetts Bay between 1749 and 1752, or by individual proprietors as were Joseph Crellius and Sebastian Zouberbühler for Brigadier-General Waldo's Maine venture. Such undertakings involved the hiring of printers to advertise the colonies, the employment of enlists and agents, the securing of shippers and transports both on rivers and on the ocean, and the hiring of guides and conductors to supervise transports and convoys. As the system grew it was neither completely centralized nor logically arranged. Thus, while Hans Luther was the chief German agent for Massachusetts Bay between 1750 and 1754, and for Waldo in the same period, he dealt either through Crellius, or directly with Waldo or with Massachusetts officials. Deputed agents

¹H. W. Kriebel, "The Schwenkfelders in Pennsylvania" in *PGSP*, XIII (1902), pp. 32-33. See also chap. vii on emigrant aid.

²In 1774 a "freight" was an adult over sixteen years of age, or three young persons under sixteen. Children were in proportion. Robert Adam to George Washington, February 14, 1774, in Worthington C. Ford (ed.), Washington as an Employer and Importer of Labor (Brooklyn, N. Y.: Privately printed, 1889), p. 50.

³Gottlieb Mittelberger's Journey to Pennsylvania in the year 1750, trans. Carl Theo. Eben (Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, 1898), pp. 38-39.

were in a sense supervised by both Luther and Crellius, making their reports to either or to both, or through one to the other. Minor agents also reported to both of them.¹

Joseph Crellius was Massachusetts agent in Europe between 1749 and 1753. In the latter year he was replaced by his former enlister, Philip Ulrich.² Reports had it that in 1747 he had tricked fellow enlisters at Bayonne and that he had enlisted people in 1751 under the name of Burckard of Franconia.³ Although he came highly recommended by Massachusetts to H. E. Luther, Aulic Counsellor of the Empire at Frankfort, and was highly regarded for the first two years by the latter, he failed to settle the necessary 480 families and his contract was voided in June, 1753.⁴ As agent for Massachusetts and Waldo he engaged various printers in Germany to print his advertisements and pamphlets. We read of Maschenbauer of Augsburg, Goetsel of Speyer, Rigelein of Herborn, Gros of Erlangen, and John Christian Leucht of Heilbron, all of whom did work for him and some of whose newspaper offices served as places of enlistment.⁵ Leucht, who was also alderman in Heilbron, was one of his more important agents, though we find him also printing advertisements for Crellius' competitor, Mr. Dick.⁶ Among the enlisters hired by Crellius were John Christian Leucht and John Lewis Martin of Heilbron,

¹Based upon Massachusetts Archives, Emigrants, passim, (hereafter cited as MA). Many of these documents have been reprinted in H. A. Rattermann, "Geschichte des deutschen Elements im Staate Maine," in Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV-XVI (1882-1884), passim.

²Ibid., pp. 245-46.

³Ibid., pp. 173, 190.

⁴Ibid., pp. 44-45, 59-61, 222, 223; Rattermann, Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV, 179-87. Crellius conducted a shipload of German Protestants to Philadelphia in 1748.

⁵MA, pp. 127-28, 192, 189, 121, 146-48, 115-17. Waldo's places of enlistment included Luther's type foundry in Frankfort, Eichenberg's newspaper office there, Leucht and Allenger's printing office in Augsburg, Goethel's [or Goetsel's] printing office in Speyer, and the place of business of merchant John Lewis Martin in Heilbron. See Waldo's advertisement in the Imperial Post newspaper no. 47, March 23, 1753, given in Maine Historical Society, Collections, VI, 325-27. See also chap. iii on literature.

⁶Abstract of a letter of Mr. Leucht, February 16, 1752. MA, p. 115.

Professor Hobbhohn and son of Kitzingen, Philip Ulrich, Bayer of Mannheim, Peter Wild, and perhaps the unknown carpenter of Walspach.¹ Some of these were guides and conductors as well as enlists, as were Philip Ulrich and John Lewis Martin who conducted parties from Heilbron to Bingen.² Even Luther and Crellius enlisted emigrants. Harling, waterman of Bingen, was also in the pay of Crellius, receiving at that place emigrants enlisted by Leucht and Martin and conducting them by Rhine transport to Rotterdam.³ John Horst of Mannheim acted in a similar manner,⁴ and other agents were employed for ocean transportation. Some persons were simply conductors; Curtius, a boatmaker of Rotterdam, in the transport business conducted the first vessel to New England in 1751.⁵ However, Steadman of Rotterdam was the shipping house through which the affair was transacted. His ship "Priscilla" carried the emigrants to New England.⁶ The second transport the following year was handled through the house of John Harvard of the same port.⁷ When friction developed between Crellius and Rotterdam shippers the former sought the services of Knevels and Company of Amsterdam; the latter were friends of Luther's and employed his son in the banking and merchant establishment.⁸ Though they were anxious for the trade the deal

¹Letters of May 9, and June 24, 1752. Ibid., pp. 118, 145.

²Letter of Martin to Luther, Heilbron, June 5, 1752. Ibid., p. 139.

³Luther's letter, Francfort, September 14, 1752. Ibid., pp. 181-82.

⁴Crellius' advertisement, April 6, 1752, Mannheim. Ibid., pp. 127-28.

⁵Letter from Luther to Lieutenant-Governor Spencer Phips of Massachusetts Bay, Frankfort, May 30, 1751 (in French), ibid., pp. 73-75. Given also in German in Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV, 179-87.

⁶Remarks upon Luther's letter written from Frankfort, September 12, 1751, in MA, p. 94. Ratterman in Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV, 230, attributes them to Phips of Massachusetts Bay colony. They seem, however, to be by Joseph Crellius.

⁷Advertisement published in Germany, May 18, 1752. Ibid., p. 134.

⁸MA, pp. 143-44, 174-76, 64-66. Luther's letter of September 14, 1752, is also in Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV, 179-87.

fell through, as Philip Ulrich and not Crellius was the agent for Massachusetts in 1753.¹

Transportation for the Maine colony was handled through the London house of Sedwick and Kilby. With this house all of the New England agents had connections. Mr. Kilby seems to have been a good friend of Waldo's and in a sense watched over the activities of Crellius, Zouberbühler, and Dick; as a prominent English agent for the Nova Scotia Commissioners he, with Luther, tried to keep the Nova Scotia and the New England commissions working in harmony and to keep the avarice of the Rotterdam merchants in check.²

Sebastian Zouberbühler, Waldo's English agent, had been an enlister and agent in Germany and England in 1742. He also served as a conductor from Holland transporting emigrants through the English firm of Sedwick and Kilby.³ Crellius was replaced by William Knöchel as Waldo's agent in Europe in 1753.⁴

John Dick was the commissary for Nova Scotia, holding his commission from the English Lords of Trade and Plantations. His deputy, G. T. Köhler, was located at Frankfort and persuaded Rotterdam merchants to enlist emigrants in the Heilbron region where they had not been before.⁵ He did a great deal of advertising in the Frankfort area, turning many emigrants whom Luther and Crellius had enlisted in Montbeliard towards Nova Scotia.⁶ Dick and Köhler had agents in Heidelberg and Mannheim; among their many agents elsewhere were Wallrab of Worms, Captain Heerbrand at Heilbron, Husher in Franconia, and perhaps Schmidt, trader in flax and hemp at Mutterstadt near Spiers, who was working against

¹Letter of Luther, Frankfort, June 23, 1754, in MA, pp. 245-46.

²Letter from Luther to Lieut. Gov. Phips of Massachusetts, September 5, 1751. Ibid., p. 85. Also in Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV, 226-28.

³Letter from Zouberbühler to Waldo, London, July 5, 1742. MA, pp. 33-35.

⁴Letter of Luther to Massachusetts, Frankfort, June 23, 1754. Ibid., p. 244.

⁵Ibid., pp. 94, 129-129a, 115-16. The ship "Mardock" under Capt. Robert Hamilton and the "Pearl" under Capt. Thomas Francis transported emigrants for him to Nova Scotia in 1751.

⁶Ibid., pp. 184, 185-86, 117.

Crellius.¹ Probably the most famous of these was Jacob Frederic Heerbrand who in January, 1752, was working for the Nova Scotia Commission through the Rotterdam house of Dunlop and Censor, and who had gotten an exclusive grant from the Regency at Stuttgart to enlist Palatines in the Heilbron region for Nova Scotia.² However, in an advertisement on February 1 he claimed to represent a company of four honest English merchants of Rotterdam and to be assembling emigrants at Heilbron for New England.³

Heerbrand is reported to have had about twenty werbers working for him, and to have assembled six hundred to one thousand emigrants, enlisting as many as twenty in one day and transporting them from Heilbron to Heidelberg by land. His ability as an en-lister seems to have rested upon his extravagant promises and able organization. Among his enlistsers were relatives, penniless soldiers, retired bailiffs, traveling journeymen, and even sentries at town gates. By bribing the latter with two florins for every emigrant secured, and by taking all without distinction and treating them well he built up a flourishing business.⁴ Beggars, women, and little children found their way into his transports, with all passage money advanced from Heilbron to whatever place they desired to go in New England. Each group going to Heidelberg was preceded and followed by a guide.⁵

¹Ibid., pp. 119-22.

²Letter of Mr. Gros, Anspach, April 30, 1752; abstract of a letter from Mr. Bayer, Mannheim, January 6, 1752. Ibid., pp. 121-22, 119.

³Advertisement dated Heilbron, in ibid., pp. 125-26. A letter of Mr. Gros, Crellius' printer at Erlangen, states that Captain Heerbrand was the deputy of Dunlop and Censor of Rotterdam, and the articles of agreement signed by those engaging with him stated that Dunlop and Censor were his exclusive shipping agents to New England. See ibid., pp. 122-24.

⁴Ibid., p. 117. Leucht, Crellius' agent, hoped that he would be able to secure fifty emigrants in this region where reports credited Heerbrand with six hundred! See Leucht's letter of April 17, 1752. Dr. Ernest Otto Hopp in his book on German indentures in the United States says that Heerbrand had a number of men in his pay "who were continually procuring victims, kidnapping beggars and vagrants who had no connections, paying two florins for every one delivered to him. He was also a ship captain and is said to have alone brought six hundred of these people to America." (Frank R. Diffenderffer, German Immigration into Pennsylvania [Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Author, 1900], p. 195.)

⁵Abstracts of two letters of Mr. Leucht, Heilbron, March 31, April 17, 1752, in MA, pp. 116-17.

Among Heerbrand's agents was John Martin Rominger, who, under power of attorney granted by the former, assembled emigrants at Heilbron for transportation to Rotterdam. Nürnberg was also a meeting place for many of his emigrants until he was compelled to flee the city in May of 1752.¹

One explanation of Heerbrand's success lies in the fact that his brother was Secretary in Stuttgart and defended him before the Privy Council, saying that he was only transporting beggars and worthless people, while the newlanders were drawing away whole families in good circumstances. It was this influence which prevented Crellius from continuing advertisements in newspapers at Heilbron and Stuttgart.²

Various Rotterdam merchant firms were enlisting people in Germany in 1752. We read of Kümich and Kurtz, Dunlop and König, and Isaac and Zachary Hope who had agents at Heilbron in the fall of 1752. The names of Heerbrand, Muller, I. C. Sprüng, Roolen, and Scheedel are mentioned as commissaries, but with the exception of Sprüng (or Spring) who worked for Messrs. Hope, we are not certain of their employers. Isaac and Zachary Hope had been in the transport business over twenty years, and Philip Ulrich is said to have secured a transport in 1752 for either Curtius of Rotterdam or de Deuling while working for the New England commission.³ De Deuling, who was a new commissary in Heidelberg and Mannheim that year, was working against Crellius and Luther, while Curtius had been in charge of Crellius' transport to New England in 1751. As son of the burgomaster at Rotterdam, De Deuling had considerable influence and money; he was said to have four ships of his own at sea and to take both sick and poor. With seafaring people circulating stories about him, his influence

¹Or Reminger. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-24. His power of attorney, dated Heilbron, March 22, 1752, is given on p. 123.

²Copy of a letter from John Christian Leucht and John Lewis Martin to Luther, Heilbron, September 2, 1752, in *ibid.*, pp. 146-48. König, a Rotterdam commissary, and evidently of the house of Dunlop and König, enticed over twenty families from Leucht at Heilbron in 1752 and gathered many emigrants, paying the workers one-half a doubloon and expenses of the journey, and offering the headman of each borough twelve ducats to secure people for him. See *ibid.*, pp. 115-16.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 146-48, 197-99, 138.

soon spread.¹

Another agent active at Heilbron in 1752 was Odinger, an innkeeper, who painted black pictures of Crelius and his agent John Henry Martin. Odinger sent his emigrants to the ship master Bartholome for transportation to America, and not only influenced people to change their destination from Massachusetts, but also caused others to refuse to enlist with either faction, not knowing in whom to trust.²

There seems to have been little or no attempt to check the activity of such agents in Germany before the early 1750's. In fact, as indicated above, many officials cooperated in the enlistment of emigrants. Nevertheless, the growing emigration to Pennsylvania, New Scotland, and other places was causing concern, --a concern which lead Nassau-Dillenburg in 1750 to instruct its officials to warn emissaries and to report all enticing of subjects.³ Stephen Franck, who was enlisting with the aid of letters from New York, was especially to be watched.⁴ The next year the activity of Ebersbach citizens who had returned from New Scotland and were enlisting in Nassau, Hesse-Cassel, and Darmstatt for Pennsylvania and New Scotland caused serious uneasiness. There was no objection to impoverished and worthless subjects leaving, but it was desirous to retain persons with property.⁵

The year 1753 was one of great activity on the part of agents in the Rhinelands and offers good illustrations of how the problem was handled by European states. In 1748 Hesse had renewed her decree of April 12, 1723, against emigration without permission, and in November, 1752, she issued another prohibition. Nevertheless, the emissary George Lübke, who was sent out by two merchants of Hamburg and Bremen, was enlisting Hessian subjects in 1753 for South Carolina by illusive representations and false

¹Or Doiling. Abstract of a letter of Mr. Leucht, Heilbron, March 26, 1752, in ibid., pp. 115-16.

²Letters of Mr. Martin, Heilbron, May 4, 9, 1752. Ibid., p. 118.

³Order dated Dillenburg, April 14, 1750, in R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 25-27.

⁴Orders dated Dillenburg, May 21, 1750. Ibid., pp. 53, 54.

⁵Report of Amtman Bausch, February 15, and reply from Dillenburg, February 23, 1751, in ibid., pp. 57-62.

promises. The object of the merchant Reissner of Bremen was to turn the emigrant trade from Rotterdam to Hamburg for his own profit. When instructions furnished the emigrant by Lübke, his agent, did not correspond with his printed advertisements, Hesse forbade further enlistments under heavy penalty. Those emigrants without permission were also to be brought to justice.¹ The Grafschaft Mansfeld also took action in 1753 against agents accepting Germans for America by ordering closer inspection of inns, taverns, and public houses by the police. At the same time the slightest negligence in the examination of passengers was to be strictly punished.²

Some persons returning to Europe from America on business became agents without a full conception of the laws and their severe penalties. Johann Christian Schmitt returned in 1753 to Nassau-Dillenburg at the age of twenty-two to remove to Pennsylvania his sister's family and to buy guns and other wares at the Frankfort fair. Harvard of Rotterdam promised him free freight if he would enlist emigrants. Only the intervention of friends and relatives saved him from punishment in Nassau-Dillenburg. He was finally released upon condition that he swear to speak to no one in the future regarding Pennsylvania, seek to enlist no one to go with him, leave the country within three days, and never return.³ Whatever his intentions had been, the damage was done, for a number of people were secured by his activity for the Rotterdam agent.⁴

Because of the misrepresentations of enlistsers, Nassau-Dillenburg thought it best in 1753 to give a monopoly to a single agent who would promise to take only those with permission to

¹Printed decree of the Hessian government, February 27, 1753. R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 192-93.

²Marion D. Learned, Guide to the Manuscript Materials relating to American History in the German State Archives (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1912), p. 109.

³R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 132-46. The oath of April 3, 1753, is given on p. 146. Oswald Siegfried was offered a free voyage to Pennsylvania similarly in 1728 by an English merchant at Amsterdam if he would write friends in the Palatinate urging their emigration as servants. See Smith, PGSP, XXXV, 187-88.

⁴Gerber, Die Nassau-Dillenburger Auswanderung, p. 22. Many of the people arriving in Philadelphia, September 29, 1753, were secured through him.

leave and under such conditions that the emigration would not be harmful. Samuel Waldo, who had argued that a monopoly would be the safest means of preventing the intrigues of false enlistsers, was appointed and all persons leaving were referred to him and his agent, the book publisher Regelein at Herborn.¹ Hans Luther, agent for the elder Waldo in Württemberg, wanted notary Bredenbeck, also employed at Dillenburg, as an agent, so that persons emigrating from Nassau lands would not have to go to Herborn to enroll. He and Secretary Knöchel desired that Waldo's concession be widened to include as large a region as possible. However, the commission was transferred from Regelein to Bredenbeck, to whom all persons desiring to go to America were thereafter referred.² This action was in accordance with the example of the Burgraviate of Kirchberg-Saßn, which a few weeks earlier had established a similar monopoly in Waldo's hands to prevent misfortune coming to its people through enticements of Dutch merchants.³

Behind the action of both states was the activity of men like Gondermann of Neunkirchen and Philip Ulrich of Rotterdam, who had enlistment headquarters at Herborn. Ulrich still was getting the majority of the business shortly after the monopoly was established. Bredenbeck complained in the first few weeks following his appointment that he was able to secure only a few emigrants. Dillenburg issued orders for the arrest of both these agents, and in the same period issued another decree against roving emissaries.⁴

¹R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 149-52, 162-63. The petition of Waldo was accompanied by a copy of his passport or authority from the Duke of Newcastle, March 2, 1753, and by advertisements from the Kayserlichen Reichs-Post-Zeitung of March 23, 1753, given in ibid., pp. 158, 161. These latter documents are also in Hessisches Staatsarchiv, Darmstadt, XI, 1. Konv. 1, pp. 10, 13, and in English translations in Samuel Waldo, "General Waldo's Circular," in the Maine Historical Society, Collections, VI, 331-32, 325-27.

²R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 164-66, 172-76, 168-69, 194-98. The Dillenburg order is dated May 2, 1753.

³Achenburg, April 25, 1753. Ibid., pp. 184-86.

⁴Ibid., pp. 178-83, 200-03. Bredenbeck charged that Ulrich had neither an English passport nor an authorized commission from either the Empire or from Captain Waldo.

On May 1, 1753, Hanover warned against agents who had authorizations from colonies and proprietors but had neither the authority of the English government nor that of the region in which they were enlisting.¹ Three months later Nassau-Dillenburg issued a decree, warning against people who claimed to be commissaries for the English colonies but in reality were enticers and stealers of men.²

It would be useless to mention the many minor agents of this period whose names are found in documents and of actions taken against them by police. Christopher Saur's Philadelphia newspaper reports that many werethrown into prison by German lords, put to hauling dirt on the streets, or given other menial tasks.³ That such action was often justified is shown by the case of Colonel Johann Heinrich Christian von Stumpel. After raising a regiment of volunteers and deserters for service in the Prussian Wars, he obtained in 1764 a tract of land in Nova Scotia.⁴ Through the strength of the grant and generous promises made to some young gentlemen in Germany who hoped to make large profits from the venture he was able to enlist around eight hundred⁵ in Württemberg and the Palatinate for the founding of

¹The Hanover decree is printed in the Hannoverische Anzeigen of May 7, 1753. Given in ibid., pp. 188-89.

²Decree of August 3, 1753. Ibid., pp. 265-66 in print and pp. 223-30 in handwriting. See also pp. 267-79 ordering the decree published throughout the Amts, and Relatio 60, which refers to this decree, pp. 231-34.

³Pennsylvania Berichte, December 1, 1754, followed by Diffenderffer, p. 190 n.

⁴Sachse, Lutheran Church Review, XX, 316-17, n. The Stuttgardische privilegierte Zeitung for September 13, 1764, p. 438, incorrectly says 120,000 acres instead of 20,000.

⁵The letter of Rev. Wachsen, pastor of the German Lutheran St. George's Church, quoted by Sachse, pp. 318-19, speaks of eight hundred emigrants, as does the Stuttgardische privilegierte Zeitung for November 27, 1764. Sachse, p. 317, says one thousand; the committee for the aid of German Protestants in London speaks of about four hundred in its petition of September 14, 1764, in Acts of Privy Council, Colonial, IV, 689-90. The Zeitung says there were some three hundred people or seventy-two families, mostly from the Palatinate, Nassau, and Hanau, in England in August and early September. See the issues of September 13, 18, 29, 1764.

his commercial city of Stumpelstadt. His extravagant promises and claims helped in creating such an influx of poor immigrants to England that his patent was revoked. He fled, leaving his colonists upon the generosity of the English, who finally established them in manufacturing in Carolina.¹ In this same year Frantz Caspar Hasenclever was secretly enlisting at Rotterdam where he had been established three years. He desired iron and steel manufacturers, as well as carpenters who knew how to build forges, for the New York colony.²

Agents were also active in France during these years.³ In 1764 occurred what has been called the last important French emigration to America in the colonial period, the emigration of 138 persons to Carolina under the leadership of the Huguenot pastor Gibert of Saintonge.⁴ English leaders were favorable to this settling of persecuted Protestants in North America, provided they became Anglican and engaged in the manufacture of coarse cloth and the production of silk. Though this last group emigration from France was small,⁵ it caused the French authorities uneasiness. The Duke of Choiseul wrote the intendant at Rouen:

"Sir, we have learned from England that a number of French Protestant families from Cévennes, Périgord and Normandy having removed to England from the ports of Marseilles and Bordeaux, and those from the coasts of Normandy in English merchant vessels have been embarked there for the English possessions with two

¹Sachse, Lutheran Church Review, XX, p. 317; Stuttgardische priv. Zeitung, October 9, 30, Nov. 27, 1764; Feb. 23, Apr. 9, July 6, 1765; Learned, Guide, pp. 214-15; Daniel Häberle, Auswanderung und Koloniegründung der Pfälzer im 18. Jahrhundert (Kaiserlautern: H. Kayser, 1919), p. 19 n.

²Learned, Guide, pp. 93-94.

³Faust, Guide, p. 171.

⁴"Projet d'Emigration du Pasteur Gibert pour les Protestants de la Saintonge et des Provinces Voisines d'après des documents inédits," in Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme Français, Bulletin, VI (1857-58), pp. 370-81; Daniel Benoit, Les Frères Gibert. Deux Pasteurs du Désert et du Refuge, 1732-1817 (Toulouse: Société des livres religieux, 1889), followed by Gilbert Chinard, Les Réfugiés Huguenots en Amérique (Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles-Lettres," 1925), pp. 209-10; Huguenot Society of South Carolina, Transactions, no. 17 (1910), pp. 32-33.

⁵Soc. de l'hist. du Prot. Fr., Bulletin, VI, 377. Gibert, who hoped six or ten thousand would emigrate, took only some two hundred to England, and he states 138 actually sailed with him.

ministers named Gibert and Boutition who conduct them; as it is important to stop the course of this emigration, I wrote to the Duke of Harcourt that since the intention of the king was that all precautions that prudence and knowledge could suggest be taken on the matter, he should concert with you on this subject and as a result give orders which are judged adequate in the execution of which you will permit me to have a share."¹

At the close of the Seven Years' War there was renewed activity of agents and further action against them. In 1763 the Upper Rhenish Circle, one of the administrative divisions of the Holy Roman Empire, issued orders against enlisters.² In February, 1766, the government of the Palatinate issued a decree condemning emissaries who were depopulating and injuring the country, and in August followed it with another measure forbidding the enlistment of young boys as soldiers.³ On February 17 Lord Johann Philipp, Archbishop of Trier, issued an order re-emphasizing the prohibition of emigration⁴ and prosecuting all foreign emissaries without passes, though the decree was aimed specifically at Russian enlisters.⁵ By 1766 foreign emissaries were enticing so many subjects from the Rhinelands under the delusion that they might better their luck elsewhere that the Electoral Rhenish Circle, under the leadership of its director, the Electoral Prince of Mainz, co-operated in a joint decree which, among other things, ordered the arrest and punishment of all enlisters.⁶

¹Versailles, January 31, 1764. Ibid., p. 381.

²Frankfort, March 9, 1763. Cited in Learned, Guide, p. 235. For administrative purposes the Holy Roman Empire was divided into "Circles," which, like the states, could act together or independently.

³Decrees issued at Mannheim, February 7, August 20, 1766. Badisches General Landesarchiv, Pfalz-Generalia, 6478, pp. 8-13.

⁴The earlier decrees of April 28, 1763, January 28 and February 21, 1764.

⁵Dated Ehrenbreitstein, February 17, 1766. R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. IV, pp. 398-90.

⁶Decree of the Electoral Rhenish Princes,--Mainz, May 12; Ehrenbreitstein, May 20; Bonn, July 12; Mannheim, July 22, 1766. R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 99-100 and 55-57. This measure was accepted by Nassau-Dillenburg and approved by the Prince of Orange for that state in June; one thousand copies of it were distributed throughout Nassau-Dillenburg in July and August. Ibid., pp. 53-55, 58-59, 85, 90, 98. See chap. vi on restriction of emigration.

In 1768 there followed Emperor Joseph's decree of July 7 which forbade all emigration from the empire and which ordered the arrest and punishment of all agents, seducers, debauchers, and commission agents.¹ This measure grew out of enlistments for Spanish service in northern Germany, but it was aimed at all withdrawal of Germans into foreign lands.² The Frankfort and Rhenish Circle proclaimed it in the Rhinelands and the little state of Nassau-Dillenburg consequently published it within her borders with the consent of Prince Wilhelm of Orange.³

If laws of individual states were unable to cope with the emigration agent it was useless to expect decrees and proclamations of a decrepit empire to be effective. Between 1768 and 1775 emigration agents seem to be as numerous as ever in the Rhinelands. Foreigners going into the Empire were watched very carefully and sometimes could obtain passes only through the intercession of the English ambassador if he thought them not likely to be enlistment agents.⁴ Other individuals, like Johann Jacob Diehl, who, when arrested, had sixteen letters on his person for delivery in Nassau lands, and who desired to secure his inheritance and take back two ministers for American churches, faced many difficulties and obstacles because of suspicion directed against them, but were freed if found innocent of persuading people to emigrate.⁵ In all states officials watched closely for enlistments, and in Basel foreigners had to present petitions of their purposes within two days and depart the moment their busi-

¹R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 201-04; also given in Friedrich Kapp, Geschichte der Deutschen im Staate New York (New York: F. Steiger, 1869), pp. 392-93. See also chaps vi, ix, and xii for other provisions of this decree.

²R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 182-83.

³Ibid., pp. 186-87, 190-94, 200-04. It was issued in Nassau-Dillenburg, July 20, 1769.

⁴Case of the suspected agent, Sebastian Müller. Ibid., pp. 214-17.

⁵He does not seem to have enticed emigrants though he was arrested on that suspicion in 1768. Ibid., Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 114-18, 140-42, 153-58; Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., pp. 37-38. It was also found impossible in 1773 to prove the schoolmaster Johann Franz of Fellerdilln to be an emigration agent. See R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 253-57.

ness was terminated.¹ Often rumors of enlistments by agents either were unfounded or they had covered their tracks well enough to avoid detection. Attempts to find ten young boys held at an inn in Frankfort for transportation to America were unavailing on the part of the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt in 1773.² In the same year an investigation of the activities of the merchant Bodo Wilhelm Stöckin of Frankfort disclosed that in the four weeks he had held his commission from English merchants to transport emigrants to Carolina he had neither accepted a single person nor registered one, much less transported any. He was a man sixty-four years of age who had been unable to secure any other work to support his family, and did not know, according to his claim, that emigration to America was contrary to the imperial decree of 1768. By action of the Deputies at Hamburg his fine was cut in half under the condition that he suffer the loss of citizenship if he enlisted anyone thereafter, while the Frankfort Senate ordered that any further enlistments by him would lead to a fine of one hundred reichsthaler and re-arrest.³

The examination at Frankfort in this same year revealed that two Philadelphians had possibly come in contact with emigrants going down the Rhine, but no evidence could be produced that they had induced anyone to emigrate to Pennsylvania.⁴ However, due to such facts, and the fact that at least eight families were turned back to Wertheim from Frankfort when the Wertheim shipper asked their passage down the river,⁵ Frankfort ordered the republication of the imperial decree of 1768 within her boundaries.⁶

¹See, for example, the investigations of Nassau-Dillenburg in 1769 and 1773 and those in Basel in the latter year. R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 212-13, 237-40; Faust, Lists, II, 198, 216. The Basel decree of January 30, 1773, is given in Faust, AHR, XXII, 130-31. Various decrees were issued in the Palatinate against promotion agents and against enlistments for foreign armies between 1766 and 1809. Learned, Guide, p. 234.

²Stadtarchiv Frankfurt am Main, Ugb. D. 42. Nr. 46, pp. 4-6. Orders dated Frankfurt, May 7, 10, 1773.

³Ibid., Ugb. A. 9, No. 3, pp. 4-6, 11-27.

⁴Andreas Glanschett and Jacob Schaffner had returned to buy iron, schythes, sickles, and books, but denied influencing Darmstadters and Württemburgers to emigrate. Ibid., No. 4, pp. 14-28.

⁵Ibid., pp. 20-23.

⁶Ibid., p. 13.

The restrictions of European states by 1774 seems to have made the emigrant business a secret one. Emigrants were now taken to America by stealth and without their property. By this time the trade had become more definitely organized in the hands of the Rotterdam merchants. John David Wilpert complained to George Washington in that year that the newlanders controlled the trade from Germany to Holland so definitely that Washington would either have to pay their prices if he wanted servants or send someone with a commission to Germany to sign agreements with the Palatines so that they might not be persuaded away by other agents or Dutch merchants.¹ Nevertheless, in the opinion of Robert Morris, the securing of laborers for a plantation in this fashion would involve the advance of money to charter a ship, there would be considerable loss from death and disease on the voyage, and the parents of such servants would be left dependent on the importer in Philadelphia. As other advice indicated that the expense of importing Palatines made the trade almost prohibitive for one unacquainted with the business, Washington's unwillingness to advance money on an uncertain proposition caused them to abandon the venture.²

How well organized the newlanders' business was is shown by Johann Carl Buettner, who reported that at Amsterdam emigrants were taken in bands of ten to thirty to houses where about one hundred apprentices would be locked up, given hammocks for beds, and fed buttermilk, soup and vegetables. During the day they were led by twos under the supervision of guards outside the city to a place where they could play boall, and were led back to the dormitories at night. Emigrants, looking forward to making their fortunes in America, in his opinion had no hatred in their hearts toward those who made their voyage possible.³

¹Letter of J. D. Woelpper to Geo. Washington, Philadelphia, March 23, 1774, in Ford, Washington as an employer and Importer of Labor, pp. 65-70.

²Letters to and from Gen. Washington, 1774. Ibid., pp. 47-72.

³Narrative of Johann Carl Buettner in the American Revolution (New York: Printed for Chas. Fred. Heartman, n. d.), pp. 16-22; Ralph Beaver Strassburger, Pennsylvania German Pioneers, ed. William J. Hinke (Norristown, Pa.: Pennsylvania German Society, 1934), I, 748.

Newlanders at Hamburg in 1792 had such an indirect way of working that it was very difficult for the government to track them down and find the person chiefly responsible for enlistments. Unemployed men and deserters meeting by chance certain agents on the streets or in the inns, would be referred to others. These in turn would refer them to American ship captains, but in such a way that if they were examined by officials it would be impossible for the emigrants either to identify the enticers by name or admit they were going to America otherwise than of their own free will. Furthermore, agents like William Berczy, though enlisting contrary to imperial decree, were armed with such an array of letters, pamphlets, credentials, and contracts that it was not difficult to convince an apprentice or journey man looking for work and more or less anxious to emigrate already that he ought to go to America.¹

The wars, the lack of the necessities of life, and the influence of foreign emissaries were causing such emigration in the Rhinelands in 1801 that both Baden and the Palatinate issued decrees against pernicious werbers. Baden even stated that subjects lacking a livelihood would receive every support for settlement in the upper Palatinate lands that they could in any way expect in distant countries, but if anything was done to help them we do not know.² In 1804 George Rapp and eight hundred persons left Amsterdam to settle in Pennsylvania; and later many fabric workers and handworkers followed from Württemberg and neighboring states.³ The activity of Baron Carol von Röder, who was enlisting Germans as American colonists in 1804 for Hamburg and Bremen merchants, caused his banishment from the lands of the Elector of Hesse and the city of Wetzlar. Berlin also issued warnings against him. His description and that of

¹Examination of Johann Gottl. Fromberger and Joh. Gottl. Schultze at Hamburg concerning their departure to Philadelphia by ship, May 1, 1792, in Preuss. Staatsarchiv, Berlin-Dahlem, Rep. 81, Gesandtschaft Hamburg, No. 149, pp. 59-65, 95-96. The shipping agents for William Berczy, New York promoter, and his agent J. J. Lemmen at Hamburg, were Kleinworth and Moeller of Hamburg. See the contract of February 7, 1792, pp. 41-43.

²Dispatches dated Munich, June 8, 1801, and Mannheim, June 16, 1801. Badische Gen. Landesarchiv, Pfalz-Generalia 6487, pp. 22, 23.

³Von Fürstenwärther's Bericht über deutsche Auswanderung nach Amerika (1818), in DAG, XVII, 449-50.

his wife were sent to Frankfort by Hesse with the result that the Frankfort government also forbade his activities. According to his own confession he raised over three hundred colonists in 1604. The next year Hesse renewed action, and denied him free passage through her lands.¹

All laws to the contrary, emissaries and newlanders continued their work of enlistment throughout the first part of the nineteenth century. In 1817 Von Fürstenwärther thought that the governments should be more alert and carefully examine them for passes. In his opinion, the best houses in Amsterdam did not take part in the emigration business.² The inherent weaknesses in all attempts to control the emigration agent seem to be: first, that those whom such laws were designed to protect--the emigrants themselves--usually were in cooperation with the enlister, and without their evidence such agents could not be punished; secondly, that banishment either led to secret activity or caused the enlister to turn to other countries. Imprisonment or detention for a short time could not cure the evil.

The promotion agent was the most potent force of all in the emigration movement from Europe. Whether it was possible to control him or not is questionable, yet failure to do so meant the failure of restriction. Some of Luther's suggestions to Massachusetts Bay province would have helped,³ but it may be argued that they would have involved not only cooperation between hundreds of little feudal states in Europe but also cooperation between the American colonies and European states. Both were impossible.

It is doubtful whether payment of fixed salaries to agents and the creation of an European bureau of emigration with expenses paid by the colonists would have solved the problem. Virtually all agents worked on a commission basis.⁴ Newlanders

¹Stadtarchiv Frankfurt am Main, Ugb. A. 9. No. 8, pp. 4-14.

²Von Fürstenwärther's Bericht, in DAG, XVII, 456, 423.

³See Luther's proposals of May 30, 1751, and June 8, 1752, in MA, pp. 64-66, 67-80, 110-14; also in Der Deutsche Pionier, XIV, 179-87, 105-08.

⁴Dick, the Nova Scotia commissary, was reported to be on a fixed salary in 1751, and Crellius hoped for a similar position relative to Massachusetts. MA, pp. 64-66.

received from one to three florins or gulden for every person over ten years of age transported to Dutch seaports, and such a person was sold in Philadelphia for between sixty and eighty.¹ Rhine newlanders, receiving seven dollars per head for every emigrant enlisted, in addition to their own passage, made considerable profit if they secured several hundred persons.² Their profit came from the passage money paid Rhenish shipmasters for transportation to Rotterdam, which by 1752 had increased to one ducat per freight.³ Rotterdam merchants advanced their agents traveling expenses and other funds through bills of exchange drawn upon German banks,⁴ but an enlistment was an expensive business, the latter were often compelled to borrow from whom they could. Such loans often went unpaid, as did emigrant agents' commissions, causing disputes and friction between enlists.⁵

It was greed which cost the merchant John Steadman of Rotterdam the loss of his shipping monopoly, as he packed emigrants into his vessels like herring to increase his profits.⁶

¹Mittelberger says three florins or a ducat while Learned says three gulden. John Lewis Martin states that Crellius promised him one Rixdollar per freight, but paid him nothing, while he could have made a ducat per freight working for someone else. Luther also indicates Crellius had promised Martin two florins per head, but paid him only a fourth of the sum agreed upon. Gottlieb Mittelberger's Journey, p. 38; MA, pp. 115, 139, 187, 137, 140-42; Learned Guide, p. 304. The gulden or florin was worth ca. forty-five to fifty cents; the Reichsthaler, or rix dollar ca. seventy-one cents. On money consult Faust, Lists, II, 27 n. 1; Sachse, PGSP, XIV (1903), p. 255, n. 80.

²Diffenderffer, Gr. Immig. into Pa., pp. 189-90.

³Abstract of letter of Mr. Leucht, Heilbron, February 16, 1752. MA, p. 115.

⁴Some agents were advanced one hundred ducats for expenses, and Peter Wild, working for Stedmann of Rotterdam, hoped to receive about 150 pistoles commission for every vessel secured. Letter of Leucht and Martin to Luther, September 2, 1752, in MA, PP. 146-48. Heerbrand had four bills of exchange totalling 1,400 florins, drawn upon Heilbron merchants, and was reported to have "as much money as he desires." See letter of April 17, 1752, in ibid., p. 117.

⁵John Lewis Martin was not paid by Crellius, and some of Luther's expenses were unpaid by Massachusetts Bay fifteen years afterwards. See letters in MA, pp. 139, 187, 140-42, 244, 268-76.

⁶Christopher Sauer's letter to Gov. Morris of Pa., March 15, 1755. Quoted in Diffenderffer, Gr. Immig. into Pa., p. 242. See chap. xii for a similar monopoly on transportation through Holland held by Zachary Hope.

At the price of five pistoles per head for transportation to America there was more profit in transporting people than in transporting goods. Often shippers like Isaac and Zachary Hope made additional sums by demanding nine pistoles freight upon arrival in Philadelphia where seven and one-half had been agreed upon in Europe.¹ While the cost of the ocean passage, food, and other things for an emigrant in 1774 was between twelve and thirteen pounds in Virginia currency, other charges and loans advanced by agents often ran the freights up to twenty-five or thirty-six pounds per person.² These additional expenses, which were also additional sources of profit for newlanders, include the making out of entries, the taking charge of luggage, and getting one through the customs, sometimes by false oaths.³

Indentured servants in Philadelphia in 1773 brought between \$150 and \$300, depending on age, condition, and sex.⁴ One family of seven people, totalling six feights, agreed in 1772 at Rotterdam to pay nine pounds per freight for transportation; the ship captain, upon the father's death, indentured the rest of the family upon arrival in Philadelphia for a total some of £122 to pay for their passage money.⁵

Bribery, graft, and thefts further swelled profits, especially the theft of emigrant property and cash.⁶ It is claimed that some Huguenot families paid as much as six or eight thousand livres to escape from France, so it is not surprising that many officials of Louis XIV, whose purpose was to obstruct the flight of subjects or guard the roads to the coast, often actu-

¹Ibid., p. 243. Between two and three thousand pounds was thus lost yearly at Philadelphia, according to Sauer.

²Letter of J. D. Woelpper to Geo. Washington, Philadelphia, March 23, 1774. Given in Ford, Washington as an Employer and Importer of Labor, pp. 66-67.

³Extract from "A Report of a Committee of the American Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool, 1822," reprinted in Appendix to Report from Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom, (1826), pp. 296-97. Given in Edith Abbott, Immigration: Select Documents and Case Records (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924), pp. 15-16.

⁴Narrative of Johann C. Buettner, p. 27.

⁵Kapp, Die Deutschen im Staate New York, p. 335.

⁶For an example, see Rev. James Fontaine, Memoirs of a Huguenot Family (New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1872), p. 126.

ally assisted emigration and sometimes even acted as guards and guides for fleeing Huguenots.¹ Even if we allow for exaggeration, the profits of the Huguenot guide Lespine were quite high.² It is difficult to determine with any precision what some agents made. When the famous Swiss agent, Jacob Joner, was charged with receiving one doubloon from each of over three hundred emigrants enlisted by him in 1749, he denied receiving even as much as half a doubloon, though his statement could not be believed.³

It is this fact of large profits in the emigrant trade that made ineffective all proposals to control the business. Those attempts which were made were efforts, for the most part, of individual states, spasmodically made to meet local and immediate crises, without any view either of the significance of the agent in the whole movement or of cooperation with other states.

¹Elie Benoist, Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes, tome troisiem, seconde partie, pp. 948-54, trans. in Baird, I, pp. 251-53.

²Douen, II, 455-58. "Great gain" was possible in removing Huguenots to America, according to a letter from La Rochelle to Boston, October 1, 1685, quoted in Baird, II, 314.

³Faust, DAG, XVIII, pp. 22-26. A doubloon equalled about twenty-one marks.

CHAPTER VI

THE RESTRICTION OF EMIGRATION, 1607-1820

A number of factors contributed to the restriction of emigration from Europe between 1607 and 1820. The major one was economic. Paradoxically, the poverty of the emigrant, which was usually the motivating force for his departure to the new world, often prevented emigration.¹ There was also a psychological cause, an uncertainty as to whether or not one might survive the long and dangerous voyage, and if he did, what his future would be in an unknown and savage wilderness. Social factors also contributed to restriction, for sometimes friends or relatives prevented the emigration of those who desired to leave.²

The tradition of the times was also against departure. To emigrate was equivalent to desertion and meant forfeiture of all political and economic rights, with the penalty of imprisonment in case of return. The Bible was used to justify this position, and governments, fearing the loss of soldiers, farmers, and industrial workers stressed the view that a person should remain in the land of his fathers. To depart was sinful, and the wage of sin was death.³ It was probably no accident that pastors of churches were, next to other governmental agents, the

¹This topic is discussed in chaps. ii, ix, and x.

²Thus Docenius, the Danish resident at Cologne, who followed William Penn to the Hague to have another interview with him, desired to emigrate to Pennsylvania in 1683. His wife objected, saying: "Now I can ride in a carriage from one house to another. In America, who knows but I would have to look after cattle, and milk the cows." Pastorius' MS notebook. Quoted by Oswald Seidensticker, "William Penn's Travels in Holland and Germany in 1677," in Pa. Mag. of Hist., II, 273.

³Ps. 37: 3 in the Lutheran version reads: "Bleibe im Lande und nähre dich redlich." See A. B. Faust, "Swiss Emigration to the American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century," in American Historical Review, XXII (October, 1916), pp. 24-25 (hereafter cited as AHR).

most active opponents of emigration.¹ From the religious viewpoint the possible loss by emigration of church members,² and from the political viewpoint the unrest created by the loss of subjects both contributed to this attitude.

Nevertheless, the major restrictive forces, aside from the economic factor of poverty of the emigrants themselves, were the governments of the time. Very few societies or private agencies tried to restrict emigration. Where they did other causes were responsible. Thus the Amsterdam Committee on Foreign Needs of the Mennonite Church, made various efforts to restrict emigration from the Palatinate between 1727 and 1733. It feared exhaustion of its funds which were intended, not to aid emigrants, which was an expensive business, but to assist Palatine refugees in settling in Holland and neighboring regions.³ It pointed out the dangers of the voyage, the heavier burdens which the Mennonites remaining at home would have to bear, and even wrote the colonists in Pennsylvania, asking them to use their influence to prevent the emigration of others.⁴ However, the attempt of the Committee to deter such emigration, though annually repeated, proved useless. The year 1738 provided the largest emigration from the region up to that time.⁵

Since governments suffered from emigration their officers

¹For examples of their activities see the cases of Mr. Certani, Catholic curé at Royan; M. De Bourdieu, pastor of the French Church in London; and Conrad Suicer, Swiss pastor in Zurich canton. In Rev. James Fontaine, Memoirs of a Huguenot Family (New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1872), p. 103; Charles W. Baird, Huguenot Emigration to America (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1885), II, 167-168; A. B. Faust and G. M. Brumbaugh, Lists of Swiss Emigrants in the Eighteenth Century to the American Colonies (Washington: National Genealogical Society, 1920), I, 49.

²Emigration was prohibited from Bern on July 8, 1717, for this reason. See A. B. Faust, Guide to the Materials for American History in Swiss and Austrian Archives (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1916), p. 33. See pp. 41, 54 for other examples.

³For the work of this committee see chap. vii on aid.

⁴J. D. de Hoop Scheffer, "Mennonite Emigration to Pennsylvania," in Pa. Mag. of Hist., II, 130-32; C. Henry Smith, "Mennonite Immigration to Pennsylvania," in Pennsylvania German Society, Proceedings, XXXV, pp. 125, 135-37, 179-80, 182, 186-88, 193-203 (hereafter referred to as PGSP).

⁵Ibid.

were important restrictive agents. Not only did they try to slow up or stop the movement by preventing the spread of promotion literature but they issued anti-emigration pamphlets. Thus the Swiss cantons in 1734 distributed without charge the Neue Nachricht alter und neuer Merkwürdigkeiten to counter the effect of Purry's Carolina propaganda.¹ There is no question but that Mittelberger's Journey to Pennsylvania in the Year 1750 was similarly used to retard emigration.² The activities of promotion agents were strictly prohibited by law³ and attempts were made to act upon the emigrant directly as, for example, through the regulation of the emigration process or by a complete prohibition of departure. Through control, prohibition of the sale, or even the confiscation of the property of those leaving, as well as by a regulation of emigrant taxes, the movement might possibly be checked.⁴ Similarly, by cutting off sources of financial help to the emigrant the movement might conceivably be regulated.⁵ During a long journey to the port of embarkation further restriction could be exercised by the states through which emigrants passed and upon the shippers transporting them.⁶ Finally, measures might be taken to induce the return of those who had already left.⁷ These methods, accompanied by warnings of officials and pastors against emigration to an unknown and distant land, were expected to be sufficient. In the last analysis, it was felt that few would emigrate if they knew they would lose all rights as citizens and would be banished forever from their fatherland.⁸ Though investigations were frequently made to learn the reasons for the departure of subjects, it is sig-

¹A. B. Faust, German Element in the United States (New York: The Steuben Society of America, 1927), I, 64. See also chap. iii for other examples.

²Faust Guide, pp. 20, 51. See also chap. iii.

³See chaps. iii and iv.

⁴On the matters of property and taxes, see chap. ix.

⁵When emigration was prohibited by a state it was usually customary to forbid anyone aiding emigrants to depart.

⁶See chap. xii.

⁷See chap. x.

⁸Faust, Guide, p. 44.

nificant that few attempts were made to remove the causes of emigration.¹ It was this attempt to dam the stream without paying attention to the headwaters that in the long run made all restrictive efforts a failure.

With the exception of the Huguenots there was no mass emigration from European states to the English colonies in America during the seventeenth century. As there was little emigration following the Thirty Years' War there were few efforts at restriction. Where there were, they took the forms previously mentioned. Before 1700, for example, Swiss cantons prohibited the emigration of subjects without permission. Those leaving forfeited their possessions and their citizenship and were not to be readmitted to the cantons.² In 1701 Bern emigrants were to pay a 10 per cent property tax, and some form of emigration control was established.³ Bavarian edicts against emigration in 1644 and 1681 stated that emigrants should be well instructed in the traditional religious faith; the latter declaration specified that an emigrant must be at least sixteen years old.⁴ Under the order of Frederick Wilhelm of Brandenburg-Prussia in 1686, and the edict of the Grafschaft Sayn Altenkirchen in 1698, emigration without governmental consent was prohibited.⁵ If a government allowed emigration it was to further its own colonies and not to populate those of other states. Sweden made various futile efforts in 1664 to prevent the emigration of Finnish colonists to New Sweden, as the latter colony had fallen into Dutch hands in 1655 and Sweden was not anxious for emigration to

¹See the mention of aid for restrictive purposes, *infra*, pp. 220-22.

²Bern decrees of March 12, 1641, February 28, 1643, January 13, 1660, in Faust, *Guide*, p. 33; Solothurn decrees of 1491, 1537, 1577, 1585, 1647, in *ibid.*, p. 98; Basel decree of June 2, 1649, *ibid.*, p. 109; Zurich decree of August 2, 1652, *ibid.*, p. 15.

³*Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁴Edicts of December 20, 1644, and December 5, 1681. Cited in M. D. Learned, *Guide to the Manuscript Materials relating to American History in the German State Archives* (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1912), p. 192.

⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 107, 84. The Elector of Brandenburg issued another Edict, October 11, 1700, regulating emigration and migration.

continue unless she could regain the colony.¹

On August 13, 1669, Louis XIV issued a royal edict the purpose of which was to retain navigators, shipbuilders, pilots, sailors, and fishermen within France. It ordered their return if they had emigrated.² A similar declaration of 1682 forbidding the emigration of Huguenot seamen and artisans³ was followed by orders to the admiralty to watch carefully for Huguenots disguised as domestic servants.⁴ In October, 1685, Protestant ministers were expelled, but their children over seven years of age had to remain.⁵ Huguenots leaving with their families and property were to be arrested, the men to be sent to the galleys for life, and the women to suffer imprisonment and confiscation of their goods.⁶ The following year the same penalty was placed upon recent converts to Catholicism who were arrested while emigrating without permission, and upon anyone helping Huguenots to

¹Amandus Johnson, Swedish Settlements on the Delaware (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1911), II, 650-52. Norwegian and Danish writers deplored emigration from those regions to Holland between 1600 and 1806 because of the loss of youths for the army, and because it was considered to be a chief hindrance to the development of agriculture, but the writer, Ludwig Daae, thought that commercial developments and trade with Holland more than compensated for these losses. See Knut Gjerset, History of the Norwegian People (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), pp. 241-42.

²Waldo G. Leland, Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1932), I, 10; Learned, Guide, pp. 224-25.

³Declaration of May 18, 1682, in Édits, Déclarations, et Arrests concernans La Religion P. Réformée (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1885), pp. 112-13.

⁴Marquis de Seignelay to the officers of the admiralty at Calais, Dunkirk, Saint Valery, La Rochelle and other ports, Versailles, June 30, 1685. Given in G. B. Depping, Correspondance administrative sous le règne de Louis XIV (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855), IV, 376.

⁵Marquis de Seignelay to de Menars, intendant Fontainebleau, October 21, 1685. Given in Depping IV, 377-78. This same letter was also addressed to other intendants.

⁶Given in Édits, Déclarations et Arrests, pp. 239-45; also in English trans. in M. Charles Weiss, History of the French Protestant Refugees, trans. Henry William Herbert (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1854), II, 378-81.

escape.¹ In 1698 it became necessary to forbid pilots to depart from French ports without permission, as they conducted Huguenots from France contrary to law.² These measures, taking no account of the causes driving Huguenots from France, neither remedied the trouble nor lessened the migrations.

French colonial policy was equally short-sighted. French colonies from the very beginning were closed to heretics. Francis I, in ordering Cartier to take fifty criminals with him to Canada in 1540, made the exception "'hors d'hérésie, et de lèse-majesté divine et humaine."³ Similarly, the Company of New France in 1627 was given exclusive commercial and proprietary control by Richelieu under the condition that every emigrant should be a Roman Catholic.⁴ However before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 many Huguenots emigrated to Canada and the West Indies and were prominent in French colonies.⁵ In 1686 it was ordered that Huguenots be expelled from Canada and that dragoons be quartered in the homes of those refusing to be instructed in the Catholic faith.⁶ Similar closing of the West Indies after 1683 and the persecution of Huguenots there⁷ caused such an exodus to the mainland English colonies that in 1688 France moderated her policy.⁸ But it was too late, and French colonization never recovered. That the

¹Declaration of May 7, 1686. Given in Édits, Déclarations et Arrests, pp. 286-87.

²Count de Pontchartrain to de Gassé, November 17, 1698, in Depping, IV, 410-11, n. 1.

³E. Gosselin, Nouvelles Glanes historiques Normandes, p. 4, quoted in Baird, I, 89, n. 3.

⁴Ibid., pp. 108-09.

⁵Ibid., pp. 201-09 and nn.

⁶Mémoire du Roy à M. de Denonville, Versailles, May 31, 1686. Massachusetts Archives, French Collections, III, 183, in French in Baird, I, pp. 126-27, n. 1.

⁷M. Adrien Dessalles, Histoire Générale des Antilles, III, 213, quoted in Baird, I, 216-17.

⁸Order of the king concerning Protestants and recently converted sent to the Islands, September 1, 1688. Given in Baird, I, 234, n. 1. Over one thousand Huguenots were sent to the West Indies as engagés between 1686 and 1688. However, as they were to be used as servants and slaves this does not seem inconsistent with the above statements. See Baird, I, 217-22 for this transportation of persons condemned to penal servitude.

moderation was only half-hearted is shown by the decision of 1715 against admitting Protestants to Santo Domingo.¹

The mass emigration of 1709 provides illustrations of the restrictive policies of the Rhineland states. On April 25 the Elector Palatine forbade emigration without permission to "the so-called island of Pennsylvania."² When the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt had his attention called a few days later to similar secret emigration of subjects from Oberon Graffschafft Katzenelnbogen, he ordered that it occur only with governmental permission under penalty of punishment both in property and person.³ Landgrave Ernst Ludwig denied that the newly-established excise was a cause of departure, but ordered an investigation into such burdens of which his subjects complained.⁴

The Elector Palatine by another order on May 12 tried to check the emigration to Pennsylvania,⁵ and on the 22nd pointed out the dangers of the long voyage and the fact that one thousand poor emigrants were stranded and in great misery on the dikes at Rotterdam.⁶ At the same time a local Nassau-Saarbrücken official asked advice as to what to do with poor families who lacked sufficient funds to buy food and pay their debts, but who wanted to go to Pennsylvania. He inquired if they should be allowed to sell their goods, and if action should be taken

¹Nov. 26, 1715. Leland, Guide, I, 10.

²Learned, Guide, p. 319. Luttrell's Diary under the date of April 28 records that the Elector Palatine made emigration subject to the penalties of death and the confiscation of goods. The death penalty appears improbable, but see Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs (Oxford: University Press, 1857), VI, 434.

³Order of Ernst Ludwig, April 29, 1709. Given in Julius Goebel, "Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte der Massenauswanderung im Jahr 1709," in Deutsche-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, XIII (1913), pp. 196-97 (hereafter referred to as DAG). This document is also referred to in Learned, Guide, p. 172.

⁴Order of Ernst Ludwig, Darmstadt, May 1, 1709. Given in Goebel, DAG, XIII, 196.

⁵Learned, Guide, p. 234.

⁶Decree of May 22, 1709. The beginning of this decree is quoted in ibid., p. 319.

against the buyers of their property.¹ The Hesse-Darmstadt government ordered its officials energetically to set forth the dangers of the voyage and the uncertainties in Carolina.² Prince Wilhelm of Nassau-Dillenburg considered the emigration movement dangerous and silly, but at first allowed subjects to emigrate if they obtained permission and paid the required taxes.³ Citizens in certain districts of Nassau were warned on June 12, 1709, of the danger of being misled into emigration to Pennsylvania and were forbidden the right to leave.⁴

At the direction of the Elector Palatine the Consistory of the Reformed Church of the Palatinate in June, 1709, threw its influence against the movement to Pennsylvania in a warning which denied that religious persecution was a cause for emigration.⁵ On the 25th Duke Eberhard Ludwig of Württemberg forbade emigrants to sell their property or to depart to America.⁶ On July 11 the Hesse-Darmstadt government took action against secret emigration from the Graffschafft Sponheim by again ordering that persons without passports be stopped and reports be made regarding them.⁷

¹Report of Amtman Heybach of N. Scheueren, May 23, 1709 regarding the emigration of Leonardt Himmigoffen, Wilhelm Duffing, and others. Given in Goebel, DAG, XIII, 193-94.

²Copy of a written order from the Hessian Chancellor and Council, dated Darmstadt, May 28, 1709. Given in ibid., 198.

³Adolf Gerber, Die Nassau-Dillenburgische Auswanderung nach Amerika im 18. Jahrhundert (Flensburg: Flensburger Nachrichten, 1930), p. 6.

⁴Order to Amtman Heybach zu Nassau Itzstein, June 12, 1709, from the Nassau-Idstein Privy Council. Given in Goebel, DAG, XIII, 195.

⁵Warning against emigration to Pennsylvania, Heidelberg, June 27, 1709, in A Brief History of the Poor Palatine Refugees (London, 1709), in Hugh Hastings (ed.), Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (Albany: J. B. Lyon Co., 1902), III, pp. 1792-93.

⁶Learned, Guide, p. 303.

⁷Copy of a Hesse-Darmstadt order to Johann Christian Kriegsmann and Sebastian Klingelhöfern, royal Hessian Ambtskeller at Braubach, and to the Ambtschultheiss at Catzenelnbogen, Darmstadt, July 11, 1709. Given in Goebel, DAG, XIII, 197. Many serfs were departing from this region to Pennsylvania without permission.

Prince Wilhelm of Nassau was willing to allow persons to depart if they paid their debts and taxes, but hoped means would eventually be found to stop the emigration movement.¹ Nassau-Dillenburg usually followed the recommendations of local officials who inquired into the condition of those desiring to leave. If they were suffering from the famine and in bad economic circumstances they were usually allowed to emigrate. If the local official thought them still able to support themselves by industrial or agricultural work they were usually forbidden passports.² By the middle of July secret emigration to Pennsylvania and Carolina had become so large that Prince Wilhelm of Nassau-Dillenburg was unwilling to tolerate longer those who avoided their obligations or broke their oaths. He decreed that those leaving could only blame themselves for their ruin, and ordered the confiscation of their property, the nullification of sales of goods, and the punishment of both the buyer and seller of emigrant property.³

Such measures proved futile. The great number of emigration petitions received,⁴ the constant disturbances caused by the sale of emigrant goods, and the non-payment of debts led Wilhelm to prohibit all departures in the decree of August 30, 1709. Those who emigrated were to be refused readmission and after three weeks their property was to be confiscated or sold to satisfy their creditors. The decree stated that children remaining with relatives or friends in the homeland would be taken care of from

¹This made clear by the decree of June 25, 1709, summarized in Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., p. 6.

²Consult, for example, the emigration petitions and reports given by Julius Goebel, "Briefe deutscher Auswanderer aus dem Jahr 1709," in DAG, XII (1912), pp. 161-62, 173-74, 142, 160-61.

³Decree of July 17, 1709. Given in ibid., pp. 145-46. This is evidently the decree referred to as of July 20 and discussed by Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., p. 7. For further reference to it see the discussion of restrictive aid, infra.

⁴Gerber says that the settlement of not less than three-fourths of all petitions received asking permission to depart from Nassau-Dillenburg in 1709 falls within this period between July 20 and August 19 following the decree against secret emigration. Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., p. 7.

from the immovable possessions of the emigrant, which, minus emigration taxes, would be given to them when they reached their majority. Prince Wilhelm was determined that disobedient subjects, who remained through the winter following the famine, should not be allowed to depart later, having created accitional debts and having helped consume the small amount of provisions available.¹

By October the Landgrave of Hesse had come to the same conclusion reached by Prince Wilhelm. On October 8 he decreed the prohibition of all emigration from his lands to Carolina and Pennsylvania. Picturing the fate of the Palatines in England and Ireland he declared that all information disseminated regarding America was falsely colored and deceitful, and ordered that all subjects be warned and vigorously prevented from emigrating.²

When the exodus of 1709 caused congestion at Dutch ports and placed upon Holland the burden of supporting stranded Germans she sent agents up the rivers to warn the Rhineland states to send no more. The States General was unable to prevent Palatines in the Netherlands from going to England, but notices were issued through Dutch ministers at Cologne and Frankfort that no more Germans would be admitted.³

England's policy definitely shifted from one of promotion to one of restriction during June, 1709, when Dayrolle, English ambassador at the Hague, began to worry over the number of Palatines. On June 24 he received orders to send no more to England, save those ready to go. He accordingly inserted an advertisement in the Cologne Gazette that no more would be accepted and sent some back to give orders to the rest. On July 1 he reported to London that "if once the warr be finished, very few of this

¹Decree of August 30, 1709. Given in Goebel, DAG, XII, 181-83 and also discussed by Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., pp. 7-8.

²Decree of Ernst Ludwig, Darmstadt, October 8, 1709, in Goebel, DAG, XIII, 200-01. Ernst Ludwig was Landgrave of Hesse, Prince of Herzfeld, Count of Catzenelnbogen, Diez, Ziegenhain, Nidda, Schaum-Burg, Ysenburg, and Büdingen.

³Copy of a resolution of August 12, 1709, of the Burgo-masters of Rotterdam; resolution of the States-General against further Palatine emigration to Holland, September 16, 1709; reports of the Dutch Ministers at Cologne and Frankfort, Sept. 24, 26, 1709. Given in Diffenderffer, PGSP, VII, 352-53, 356-57, 357-58.

people will abandon their country and you may lose the opportunity of having them."¹ His notices failed to check the stream. He was unable to persuade 1,200 at Rotterdam to go home, and England gave him no encouragement that more would be aided financially. Nevertheless, he shipped 1,433 on July 18, the very day an order was received from England to accept no more. As he was unable to prevent Germans from going to Great Britain at their own or at private expense, without passports, the situation was critical.² In December a royal proclamation warned others against coming to England and stated that many already in the British Isles would be returned to Germany.³ The House of Commons declared in 1711 that their transportation to England at public expense was extravagant, and a misuse of public funds; that those who brought them were, therefore, enemies of the Queen and of the Kingdom.⁴

As both rich and poor were going to Pennsylvania and Carolina from Württemberg in large numbers and authorities made no particular effort to restrain them, the Duke in 1717 forbade the sale of emigrant property.⁵ A commissary at Frankfort who was enticing subjects to Louisiana is mentioned in a decree of 1720 forbidding Württembergers the right to emigrate "to the islands of Mississippi."⁶ Shortly afterwards Emperor Charles VI forbade the Schwenkfelders, who were being persecuted in Silesia, to sell their property or emigrate from that region of the

¹Walter Allen Knittle, Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Co., 1937), pp. 59, 57-59. Knittle's work is largely based on British Public Record Office MSS.

²Ibid., pp. 59-60.

³Declaration of December 31, 1709, given in Diffenderffer, PGSP, VII, 272, n. 11a; Das verlangte, nicht erlangte Canaan, chap. v, p. 94-99, quoted in Daniel Haberle, Auswanderung und Koloniegründung der Pfälzer im 18. Jahrhundert (Kaiserlautern: H. Kayser, 1919), pp. 48-50.

⁴Resolutions of House Commons, April 14, May 31, 1711. House of Commons Journal, XVI (1709-1711), 598, 684-85.

⁵Decree of September 8, 1717, Stuttgart. Cited in Learned, Guide, p. 303.

⁶Stuttgart, May 18, 1720. Cited in ibid., p. 303.

Empire. Persons aiding them were also to be severely punished.¹ In 1732 Karl Albrecht of Bavaria confirmed former restrictive edicts in a declaration of April 30 at Munich,² and in 1737 the matter of emigration to Pennsylvania again received attention in Baden.³ In this same year Frederick Wilhelm I ordered that no subject leave from Prussian lands without a passport and two years later issued further regulations against emigration.⁴ In 1741 attempts were made to limit emigration from the Palatinate.⁵ Four years later Baden published another proclamation concerning the departure of subjects to Pennsylvania.⁶ The great number of decrees is proof of the failure to handle the problem.

In 1749 Duke Carl of Württemberg directed that twenty-five or more persons desiring to go to Pennsylvania from Reudern, Neckar Denzlingen, Grözingen, and elsewhere be allowed to leave provided they renounce their rights as citizens and never again return to Württemberg.⁷ Compliance with these conditions, along with the previous discharge of debts and the withholding of property of minors until they were of age, were usually required of emigrating subjects.⁸ In a declaration in 1750 Nassau-Dillenburg laid down the conditions under which emigration would be allowed from her territories. After the emigrant had paid his debts and

¹C. Hendrick, Historical Sketch of the Schwenkfelders quoted in H. W. Kriebel, "The Schwenkfelders in Pennsylvania," in PGSP, XIII, p. 24.

²Cited in Learned, Guide, p. 192.

³Ibid., p. 229.

⁴Decree of May 7, 1737, at Königsberg and Edicts of 1739. Cited in ibid., p. 107.

⁵Ibid., p. 235.

⁶Ibid., p. 229.

⁷Decree dated Stuttgart, April 11, 1749. Quoted in Adolf Gerber, Neue Beiträge zur Auswanderung nach Amerika im 18. Jahrhundert (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, n. d.), pp. 4-5.

⁸Ibid., p. 5. Thus after Christopher Bartholemew Mayer and family emigrated from the free imperial city of Ulm in Swabia to Maryland in 1752, the city authorities held him in such esteem that they had a certificate engrossed in Latin and sent to him in Holland reserving for him and his family the right of citizenship should he or they ever return. See Francis B. Mayer, "Memoranda in reference to Early German Emigration to Maryland," in Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland, Fifth Annual Report, 1890-91, p. 15.

been warned against expecting a better livelihood in America he was to pay the tenth penny and the 2 per cent departure tax.¹ If his remaining property was valued at six hundred gulden or more his petition was to be rejected. If he scarcely possessed the means of making his livelihood and would likely fall as a burden upon his community he was to be granted permission to depart without hesitation.² This remained her policy in following years.³

The Nürnberg city council in 1752 allowed the promotion agent John Martin Rominger to enlist emigrants for New England provided they desired to go and had permission to leave. However, he was told he would have little success "as there are rather too few than too many Citizens and Subjects in these Parts [Nürnberg]."⁴ Governmental opposition to agents made it difficult to enlist emigrants in Württemberg and at Heilbron in this same year.⁵ The Palatine Elector in his decree of June 21 complained of the misleading of subjects by agents and the harm done in his state by those returning from Pennsylvania and "other American provinces" under the pretext of caring for the property of their relatives.⁶ The English king, George II, also issued a warning

¹See chap. ix on property and its taxation.

²Relatio 34 of May 2, 1750. In Preussisches Staatsarchiv, Wiesbaden, Bestand VII, R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 39-41 (hereafter referred to as R. 206). See also Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., pp. 16-17. This relatio was approved on June 8 by William of Orange, ruler of Nassau-Dillenburg, who pointed out that free men could not be refused departure from the country after the payment of their just obligations, though he hoped well-to-do persons could be retained by persuasion. R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 56.

³See, for example, the case of Johann Eberth Michael of Wurgendorff, 1766, in ibid., Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 3-7, 21-22, 62-64.

⁴Copy of Nürnberg resolution of 1752, in Massachusetts Archives, Emigrants, p. 123 (hereafter cited as MA).

⁵Letter of Joh. Christian Leucht and Joh. Lewis Martin to Hans Luther, Heilbron, September 2, 1752, in ibid., pp. 146-48.

⁶Edict dated Mannheim, June 21, 1752. Cited in Learned, Guide, pp. 214, 319.

against emigration from Hanover in 1754,¹ but the Seven Years' War (1756-1763) brought emigration at times to a standstill. In the last quarter of the century emigration from Württemberg was largely to Poland and other eastern European states.²

Nevertheless, the Elector Palatine found it necessary in 1760 to forbid the sale of property unless permission to emigrate had previously been granted.³ There was a scarcity of servants in the Palatinate in 1764 because so many of them had emigrated,⁴ and the authorities of Jülich-Berg were not quite certain whether that state would be better or worse off by allowing subjects to go to the "new French establishments in America."⁵ Edicts against emigration were issued by Maximilian Joseph of Bavaria in 1764 and 1766.⁶ At least four prohibitive decrees were published in the Palatinate in 1764.⁷ Only one measure had been issued in Nassau-Dillenburg in the ten-year period preceding 1763,⁸ but three were issued within two years following the ending of the Seven Years' War.⁹

The policy in regions jointly administered by Nassau-

¹Statement made in a decree of the Duke of Cleves, July 8, 1754. Quoted from the Neuchâtel Archives de l'Etat, Manuaux du Conseil d'Etat, Restrits de sa Majesté, in Faust, Guide, p. 169.

²Adolf Gerber, Beiträge zur Auswanderung nach Amerika im 18. Jahrhundert aus Altwürttembergischen Kirchenbüchern (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, n. d.), p. 2.

³Decree of March 4, 1760. Cited in Learned, Guide, p. 214.

⁴Rescript dated Mannheim, March 3, 1764. Ibid., p. 215.

⁵Probably French Guiana. Decree of Electoral Prince Otto, Ollendorf, March 15, 1764. Ibid., p. 94.

⁶February 28, 1764, and January 3, 1766. Ibid., p. 192.

⁷March 3, May 26, May 29, and November 27, 1764. Referred to in Häberle, p. 6, n. These edicts against emigration in general are all forerunners of the general imperial decree of 1768 discussed below.

⁸That of August 3, 1753.

⁹Decrees of February 28 and April 12, 1764, July 17, 1766. Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., p. 30. See chap. ix for these laws on emigrant property.

Dillenburg and the Electorate of Treves was quite similar to that within the Nassau lands.¹ In such areas it was often difficult to secure as effective cooperation as was accomplished in this case by the joint decree of 1766.² Without the combined action of the two governments concerned any regulation was impossible, for in theory, at least, the laws of neither state were applicable alone, and edicts of the Electoral Circles³ of the Holy Roman Empire could only be enforced by the joint action of the two sovereignties.⁴

The states of the Rhenish Circle, under the leadership of the Mainz Elector in 1766, issued a joint decree forbidding emigration outside the boundaries of the Empire. This measure ordered the arrest and punishment at hard labor of all departing secretly; forbade the alienation of property under the penalty of confiscation of the purchase price and annulment of the sale; allowed no foreigners within the Empire without passes; and ordered the arrest and punishment of all enlistees and emissaries.⁵ Frankfort, however, opposed this united action and advocated instead agreements between the respective governments.⁶

Throughout the eighteenth century the regulation of emigration to America was a part of the larger problem of control of emigration in general. One part of this larger problem was to check desertions from the army and to prevent the enrollment

¹Several subjects emigrated from the joint or common districts of Camberg and Wehrheim to southern Russia in 1766. R. 206, Vol. I, Pt. IV, pp. 391-94, 396-97, 388; Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 8-12, 14, 406-08.

²R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 47-48.

³Administrative divisions of the Empire.

⁴R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 220-31, especially 222-25. In practice, the Treves Electorate had often issued decrees for these areas without consulting Dillenburg.

⁵Decree of the Rhenish Princes, Mainz, May 12; Ehrenbreitstein, May 20; Bonn, July 12; Mannheim, July 22, 1766. Ibid., pp. 99-100 and 55-57. This measure was accepted by Nassau-Dillenburg and approved by the Prince of Orange for that state in June; one thousand copies of it were distributed throughout Nassau-Dillenburg in July and August. Ibid., pp. 53-55, 58-59, 85, 90, 98.

⁶Dispatch from B. W. Eck, Frankfort, June 20, 1766. Ibid., Pt. I, pp. 66-68.

of the subjects of one state as soldiers of other states.¹ A decree of July 31, 1738, by Emperor Charles VI for the Austrian Netherlands illustrates the stringent regulations taken to prevent unknown emissaries from depopulating the Empire of soldiers.² Several ordinances were passed during the 1760's forbidding emigration from the Austrian Netherlands to foreign countries.³ While Joseph II's proclamation of 1768 grew out of the danger of depopulation of the Empire because of the enlistments for Spanish service in northern Germany, it also applied to emigration to America. This measure forbade emigration save where permitted by imperial law, prohibited the sale of emigrant property, and ordered the imprisonment and punishment of those leaving secretly. Promotion agents were to be punished and all gatherings for emigration to be broken up.⁴ This declaration of the Emperor was subsequently proclaimed by the Frankfort and Rhenish Circles and by some of the individual states, which made it more certain of enforcement in their lands.⁵ Although the decree of the Imperial Aulic Council in 1769 prohibiting emigration to foreign lands was not very effective, the number of Palatines going to America was smaller between the large exodus of 1764 and the famine years of

¹On the subject of soldiers, see also chaps. 11, viii, x, and xii.

²Decree against enlistments for the service of foreign powers, Brussels, July 31, 1738 in Recueil des Anciennes Ordonnances des Pays-Bas Autrichiens, 3e série (Bruxelles, 1860-1914) V, 225-226.

³May 12, 1764, November 20, 1765, November 20, 1766. Ibid., IX, 123-24 notes; 278.

⁴Joseph II's proclamation of July 7, 1768, is given in R. 206, Vol. II, pp. 201-04 and on pp. 188-89; also from Schlözer's Stats-Anzeigen, VI, p. 215, in Friedrich Kapp, Geschichte der Deutschen im Staate New York (New York: F. Steiger, 1869), pp. 392-93. Attempts were made to prevent emigration from Regensburg, Cologne, Nuremberg, Lubeck, Ulm, Frankfort, Bremen, and Hamburg. See Learned, Guide, p. 181. On the decree of 1768, consult chaps. iv, ix, and xii.

⁵R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 186-87, 190-94, 200-04; Stuttgardische privilegierte Zeitung, August 20, 1768, p. 403; Learned, Guide, pp. 192-93. The order was repeated at Munich August 5 and at Frankfort August 14, 1768; at Dillenburg, July 20, 1769. Several desiring to emigrate from Württemberg in 1771 were refused permission because of this imperial decree. Gerber, Neue Beiträge, p. 39.

1770-1771.¹ Nevertheless decrees against enlists and deserters were published yearly in the Austrian Netherlands after 1775,² and it became necessary in Nassau-Dillenburg in 1768 to republish the decree of 1766 against the emigration of young, unmarried persons, as single persons were continuing to leave for the American colonies.³

Emigration from Europe between 1776 and 1815 was smaller because of wars and because of unsettled conditions in America.⁴ German states continued restriction by forbidding emigration without permission or by prohibiting it completely but were not very successful.⁵ After Lafayette's escape to America Louis XVI

¹A memorial from Nova Scotia even before Joseph II's decree complains that "even the German States hinder people from passing through their dominions, so that the Palatines, who were wont to go in great numbers to America, are now as difficult to be got as people from any part of his Majesty's dominions, [Great Britain] who are forbid to be engaged for this purpose." Philadelphia shipping lists show a similar condition; whereas eleven ships arrived with immigrants in 1764 and nine in 1771 four arrived in 1768 and four in 1769. See Memorial of Lord William Campbell, April 8, 1768, in Acts of Privy Council, Colonial, VI, 461-62; Ralph B. Strassburger, Pennsylvania German Pioneers, ed. William J. Hinke (Norristown, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania German Society, 1934), I, 774-75.

²For the Austrian Netherlands, the decree of the Queen Empress, Brussels, February 1, 1735, ordered that the Ordinance of May 12, 1764 concerning emigration be repeated yearly, and that the ordinances on desertion and enlists be republished. Recueil des Anciennes Ordonnances, 3e série, XI, 3.

³Decree of June 3 and July 17, 1766. R. 206, Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 150-60.

⁴Julius F. Sachse, "Lutheran Clergy of London, and how they aided German emigration during the XVIII century," in Lutheran Church Review, XXII(1903), 571. Over 9,261 emigrants reached the port of Philadelphia between 1785 and 1808. See Strassburger, III, ix.

⁵A Salzburg decree of March 30, 1774, forbade emigration without governmental consent, punished those aiding emigrants, and confiscated the property of those leaving without permission. Further decrees and orders regarding emigration were issued in 1796, 1799, and 1805. Elector Theodore of the Palatinate on February 23, 1779, forbade emigration without governmental permission of serfs and free subjects. This measure was followed by further prohibitions on January 19, 1785, and February 5, 1793. In 1784 Austria summarized about ninety-six separate decrees in one measure; a report of June 4, 1784, stated that emigration was prohibited under penalty of confiscation of property and hard labor, if caught. Officials aiding emigrants were subject to fine or six months' labor. However, secret emigrating

signed an order forbidding French officers to take service in the English colonies without permission, but his ministers never carried out the command.¹ Because the Empire suffered from the sending of German troops to America, the Director of Imperial Enlistment in June 1780 was ordered to check the evil by emigration edicts so that preference would be given to imperial over Prussian enlistments, both as to officers and men.²

Frederick the Great complained of the sacrifice of German blood in a war in America that did not concern the Empire. Behind his objections were the refusal of the ruler of Hesse to allow him the use of Hessians in his troubles with Poland and Austria and also his strong anti-English bias.³ The use of German soldiers in the American War for Independence was also attacked by others. The writer Schiller in his Kabale und Liebe strongly condemned forcible recruiting for the American cause, and pictured the extravagant and corrupt court of the Duchy of Württemberg.⁴ In a pamphlet, which was promptly suppressed by the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, Mirabeau also protested against the greed of the German princes in their selling of Hessian

was occurring in 1787 and 1791 from Austrian lands to America, and further discussion on emigration control occurred in 1792 and 1794. On July 5, 1799 a general emigration law of Bavaria confiscated the property of emigrants leaving without permission. See Faust, Guide, pp. 188, 227, 228, 253, 263; Learned Guide, pp. 181, 188, 200, 194, 218, 235; Häberle, pp. 2 n., 6 n.

¹Henri Doniol, La Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États Unis d'Amérique (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1886), II, 395 n. 2.

²Faust, Guide, pp. 238-39. The prince of Nassau-Usingen reported from Erfurt, August 29, 1780, that Prussian and other troops were being recruited in increasing numbers by German princes for their regiments in America.

³Letter of Frederick II to the Margrave of Anspach, Potsdam, October 24, 1777, in Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand (Berlin: Chez Rodolphe Decker, 1847), VI, p. 117; letter of October 24, 1777 in Politische Correspondenz Friedrich's des Grossen (Berlin: Reimar Hobbging, 1925), XXXIX (1777), p. 367.

⁴This play attacks the rule of Dukes Eberhard Ludwig (1693-1733) and Karl Eugen (1744-1793), who crushed the people with heavy taxes and confiscated private and personal property. See Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller, Kabale und Liebe, ed. William Addison Hervey (New York: Henry Holt, 1912), pp. 34-37, Act II, Scene II.

soldiers to the English.¹ The attitude of the German states as a whole is difficult to determine. One official justified such recruiting because it enabled states to pay their large debts, and because returning troops brought foreign money into the country.²

Opposition to foreign enlistment continued in Germany after 1783. In 1788 the Elector Palatine decreed the punishment of agents enlisting soldiers for foreign service as well as the punishment of those helping promote the desertion of troops and other subjects.³

Friedrich Wilhelm of Prussia in 1792 looked upon emigration as quite harmful, as it depopulated the Empire and brought about desertion and illegal secret departures.⁴ It was for these reasons that he opposed the enlistment of fifty men and women by William Berczy for the Genesee Association of New York. Accordingly he asked Hamburg to examine departing ships for Prussian subjects, and remove them.⁵ Deserters from the army were to be returned to Berlin on the first transport. All arrested emigrants were to be asked their trades, whether or not they were "on their travels," the amount of their property, whether or not they had been enticed to emigrate, and if they intended to return to the fatherland later. On these matters

¹This pamphlet, Avis aux Hessois, 1777, is very rare, and the present author was unable to find it in Mirabeau's works. But see Edward J. Lowell, The Hessians (New York: Harper and Bros., 1884), pp. 21-23.

²See the statements of Freiherr von Gemmingen, minister to the Margrave of Anspach, given in Friedrich Kapp, Der Soldatenhandel deutscher Fürsten nach Amerika (Berlin: Julius Springer, 1874), pp. 108, 123, 124). An Eng. trans. is given in Lowell, pp. 23, 24. See chap. x on the matter of soldiers returning to Europe.

³Decree of Count Carl Theodore dated Mannheim, August 22, 1788. In printed form in Badisches General Landesarchiv, Pfalz-Generalia, 6487, pp. 14-17 (hereafter cited as BGL, 6487).

⁴Prussian order to Von Goeckhausen at Hamburg, Berlin, April 22, 1792; Von Goeckhausen to the Royal Cabinet Ministerium, Hamburg, April 28, 1792. Both in Preussisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Berlin-Dahlem, Rep. 81, Gesandtschaft Hamburg, No. 149, pp. 45, 68-70.

⁵Ibid., pp. 68-70. On William Berczy and the Genesee Society see chaps. iii, v, x, and xii.

reports were to be made to Berlin.¹

Austria in 1794 discussed the formation of an army corps made up of French deserters, exiles, emigrants, and war prisoners.² Maximilian Joseph, Count Palatine of the Rhine and Duke of Upper and Lower Bavaria, in 1800 also ordered the punishment of persons aiding soldiers to desert.³ The following year he issued another decree against promotion agents and banished those emigrating without permission.⁴ Nassau-Dillenburg also prohibited colonial enlistments in 1804.⁵ A decree of the Grand Duchy of Baden, March 6, 1809, specified that an emigrating subject should either fulfill his military service before leaving or make a sufficient cash deposit to hire another person in his place. Otherwise emigration was forbidden until the age of freedom from war service was reached.⁶

Unexamined documents indicate that emigration to America decreased between 1776 and 1815.⁷ European states had opposed

¹Dispatch to Von Goechhausen at Hamburg, Berlin, May 6, 1792; Von Goechhausen to Stadt Syndicat Doctor Doormann, Hamburg, May 15, 1792. Ibid., pp. 73-74, 84-85.

²Faust, Guide, p. 241.

³Order dated Amberg, August 4, 1800, to the Electoral General Lands Commission at Mannheim. In BGL, 6487, pp. 18-19.

⁴Decree of November 16, 1801, in ibid., pp. 34-36, 33, 40.

⁵Learned, Guide, p. 170. However, she continued to allow poor persons to emigrate. See R. 206, Vol. III, Pt. II, pp. 145-48, 134-36, 230-31.

⁶Notice in the Gorsherzoglich Badisches Regierungsblatt of Carlsruhe, March 11, 1809, in BGL, 6487, pp. 57-58.

⁷There was a considerable emigration from Württemberg to America in 1780-81, emigration of young boys from the Graftschaft Sayn Altenkirchen in 1784, and emigration from Mechlenburg-Schwerin to South Carolina and New Scotland in 1789 and 1792. Emigrants were going from Alsace to America and Russia between 1791 and 1812, and thirty-one Prussian subjects left Hamburg for Pennsylvania in 1801. There was also emigration from Wiesbaden and Oldenburg in 1805-06. In 1805 Wills and Company were securing emigrants for Louisiana and Florida in the regions around Wertheim and Frankfort. Baden emigration between 1780 and 1809 was confined largely to military recruiting and departures to the Russian Crimea. Learned Guide, pp. 304, 84, 291, 226, 35, 169, 292, 311; BGL, 6487, pp. 45-109.

emigration to America up to that time, as John Quincy Adams indicated to Fürstenwärther in 1817.¹ And they continued to oppose it,² but by 1817 emigration had increased so greatly that one report mentioned the departure for America from Württemberg, Switzerland, and the Rhinelands of several thousand persons and the desire of eighty thousand more to emigrate.³ Three thousand from Trier alone desired to go to the United States.⁴

Between 1734 and 1770 the emigration problem was a vital one in Zurich canton, Switzerland. Until the measure of November 3, 1734, control seems to have been largely regulatory,⁵ but by this decree permission was made necessary. Not only were the dangers of the journey to Carolina and the falsities of promotion literature pointed out but the sale of emigrant property was forbidden and agitators were to be seized and punished. Those leaving secretly were to forfeit their landright and to be denied readmission.⁶ An emigration commission was also created.⁷

As emigration increased rather than diminished another order was issued in January, 1735, prohibiting emigration to Carolina under pain of the loss of citizenship and landright. The buyers of emigrant property were to be prosecuted and agitators were to be punished without delay.⁸ Other measures to the

¹Letter of Fürstenwärther to Baron von Gagern, Philadelphia, December, 1817. Quoted in Max J. Kohler, "An important European Commission to investigate American-Conditions (1817-1818)," in UAG, XVII, p. 402.

²Restrictive measures were taken by Westphalia and Mannheim in 1817 and by Prussia in 1819. Learned, Guide, pp. 152, 319, 75.

³Communication of Schultheiss and Dr. Ebermaier to Oberpräsident Gr. v. Solms, Laubach, May 9, 1817. Cited in Learned, Guide, p. 49.

⁴Learned, Guide, p. 49. ⁵Faust, Guide, pp. 14, 18, 20.

⁶The decree is given in full in German in ibid., pp. 15-16. See also the quotation in chap. iii on literature.

⁷The Commission resolved to assist no one with money or passes, and to hinder emigration in every way. December, 1734. Ibid., p. 57.

⁸Decree of January 29, 1735, given in German in ibid., pp. 16-17.

same effect, dealing with emigration to Carolina, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and other places in America, followed in 1736, 1739, 1741, and 1744. They seem to have had little effect;¹ the emigration fever had to run its course. Attempting to control and restrict it were the local officials, or landvogts, who constantly referred matters for decision to the cantonal government and received in return advice and directions.² Decrees issued were read aloud in the churches of the canton. While the most active agents in persuading families not to leave were the local parish ministers and church synods, it is likely that local pastors were less influential than economic factors in preventing emigration, and that they sometimes took credit which they did not deserve.³ At its best, persuasion was not very effective.

Bern's emigration policy between 1710 and 1754 was determined largely by the flow of the emigration stream. While prohibiting emigration in 1717 on the ground that people might abandon or lose their religious faith in a foreign land, in 1710 she allowed the emigration of undesirable Anabaptists and Mennonites, whose souls, presumably, were already lost. In 1710-11 Bern warned poor subjects of the dangers and hardships of emigration to Carolina and promised them help if they would stay home. Yet she encouraged the schemes of the agent Ritter to get rid of undesirable paupers and criminals in the canton.⁴ In 1725 emigration without permission was denied by a decree of the Council, and in 1728 a congress of the thirteen Swiss cantons decreed that the local landvogts should be notified by those planning to emigrate.⁵ When the emigration fever became strong in 1734 Bern was inclined to pursue a policy of watchful waiting, allowing those

¹Decrees of February 3, 1736, May 13, 1739, December 7, 1739, February 4, 1741, and March 18, 1744. Cited in ibid., pp. 17, 14, 29, 32. In the 1760's and 1770's Zurich emigration seems to have been to Spanish and Russian colonies and to Prussian Pomerania. Ibid., pp. 18, 22, 32, 113.

²Ibid., p. 20.

³Ibid., p. 32; Faust, Lists, I, 68, 55-56, 89-90.

⁴Faust, Guide, pp. 33, 54, 41, 42. See infra, p. 221, and chap. viii.

⁵Decrees of June 28, 1725, and October 16, 1728. Cited in ibid., pp. 54, 57.

who paid their emigration taxes to depart if they were not dissuaded from it by officials.¹

When Zurich set up an Emigration Commission and in 1735 forbade emigration to Carolina, Bern followed her example. Early in January a commission was established,² and emigration was denied those having less than five hundred Bernese pounds.³ It was felt that subjects would listen to warnings concerning the dangerous voyage and bad conditions in Carolina, and that they would not emigrate when they realized they would lose their citizenship and landright.⁴ Both obstruction and restriction were attempted by Bern in this period but to no avail.⁵ Passport restrictions and confiscation of property were designed to prevent secret emigration. However, if children remaining in the canton were provided for, if one had five hundred pounds, and if one paid his taxes he was allowed to depart.⁶ Warnings against emigration and restrictions on agents and promotion literature continued to be the rule. A proposal to increase the departure tax in 1738 was turned down because it was feared that it would only cause further dissatisfaction and bring attention to the emigration movement, which by that time seemed to have passed its crest.⁷ Nevertheless, further prohibitive edicts were necessary in the next few years,⁸ and for the rest of the century Bern continued to cope with the problem.

The complete prohibition in 1742 of emigration to any place in America, with the forfeiture of citizenship, landright, and property upon departure, was not effective, for in 1744 people were going to Carolina "in hordes."⁹ A decree of

¹Ibid., pp. 43, 44.

²Ibid., pp. 44, 57.

³Decree of January 12, 1735. Cited in ibid., p. 35. A Basel pound in 1737 equalled 2/15 of a Pennsylvania pound. It was equivalent to twenty shillings or 0.8 gulden or florins, and worth, in American money, somewhere between thirty cents and a dollar. See Faust, Lists, II, pp. 27 n., 85.

⁴Faust, Guide, p. 44.

⁵Ibid., pp. 35, 44.

⁶Ibid., p. 44.

⁷Ibid., pp. 45, 46, 54-55.

⁸Orders and decrees prohibiting emigration to Carolina, April 10, 1738, January 19, 1742, March 17, 1742, April 26, 1742. Ibid., pp. 35, 47.

⁹April 26, 1742. See Faust, AHR, XXII, 29; Faust, Guide, p. 35. Those returning were put in prison.

of 1749, and a measure of May 21, 1753 which prohibited emigration to Carolina and Pennsylvania and reaffirmed the law of April 26, 1742, also failed to check the mass emigration of that period, even though they laid down stricter penalties.¹ There were numerous examinations of emigrants, and various proposals were made in the Rath to check the movement.² Between 1754 and 1770 the fear was often expressed that the canton would be depopulated by emigration to America and other countries.³ Even in the period of moderate departures between 1754 and 1763, ten thousand persons are said to have left the canton.⁴ Although a special commission was proposed in 1765 to suggest measures to prevent depopulation,⁵ we find no record of anything being done. Subsequent lessening of the emigration stream made further fears unnecessary for a time.

The high tides of Basel emigration to the American colonies occurred in 1734-43, 1749-52, 1767-73, and 1816-17.⁶ The initiative in checking the first of these waves was taken by Zurich which induced the Council of the Thirteen Lords to restrict emigration to Carolina by preventing the sale of emigrant goods and by checking the activities of enlistsers.⁷ A further restrictive measure followed on April 20, 1735, but various exceptions were made to both decrees.⁸ In less than a year the

¹Prohibitions of May 6, 1749, and May 21, 1751. Faust, Guide, pp. 36, 50. See also pp. 39, 55.

²Ibid., pp. 49, 112, 113.

³Faust, AHR, XXII, 42-43; Faust, Guide, pp. 36, 51. Emigration was prohibited in 1765 to Russia and on November 23, 1767, to Spanish colonies. Emigration to Spain was restricted on December 21, 1768, and a warning against Prussian Pomerania issued on November 29, 1771.

⁴Ernst Lerch, Die Bernische Auswanderung nach Amerika im 18. Jahrhundert (1909), p. 31, cited in Faust, AHR, XXII, 42-43. Four thousand entered foreign military service and six thousand emigrated to other countries.

⁵Faust, Guide, p. 51; Faust, AHR, XXII, p. 30.

⁶Faust, AHR, XXII, 31; Faust, Guide, p. 101.

⁷Zurich's request of January 3, 1735 led to the restrictive measure of January 5. The Council of Thirteen was a committee of the Kleinen Rath, the governing body of the canton. Faust, Guide, pp. 102, 103, 109.

⁸Ibid., pp. 102, 109; Learned, Guide, p. 236. Similar decrees were issued, December 11, 1734, and March 9, 1735.

latter measure had become ineffective. Warnings against emigration were so useless that Basel willingly allowed various groups to go, provided they made arrangements for children left in the homeland and paid their emigration taxes before departure.¹ In 1740 the Council of Thirteen admitted their inability to check determined emigrants.² After deciding to grant no further permission to depart new permissions were constantly granted. One young woman, who had earlier been refused permission, in 1736 was allowed release from serfdom in order to marry a man who was emigrating. This gave her the right to go wherever he went, even to America.³ A report of the Deputies for Rural Affairs in March, 1749, discussed the hardships and delays of the journey to Pennsylvania. It asserted:

Such circumstances should persuade an otherwise sensible person not to make such a voyage; however, we have noticed among those whom we have questioned and among those who have had private interviews with some of us, to whom all kinds of warnings have been made, that the more one tries to discourage them by giving truthful and sane reasons, the more confirmed they become in their bad intentions. They believe that we are begrudging them their imagined luck, and that the government would derive great benefit from them if they were to stay in the country. They think that that is why we make their departure so difficult; they would become more determined in this if the matter were drawn into a longer deliberation.⁴

For this reason it was recommended that the emigration of childless couples and unmarried persons be permitted, provided all taxes be paid, their citizenship surrendered, and their return to Basel denied.⁵

Probably the most important Basel decree was that of

¹Faust, Guide, pp. 102, 103, 104, 109, 111.

²Decision of the Council of Thirteen, March 3, 1740, cited in ibid., p. 109.

³Faust, Lists, II, p. 110.

⁴Report of March 8, 1749. Given in German in A. B. Faust, "Unpublished Documents on Emigration from the Archives of Switzerland," in DAG, XVIII, 17-21.

⁵Ibid. See also Faust, Guide, 104-05. On the matter of children, see cnap. xi.

August 13, 1749.¹ After pointing out the dangers of emigrating to Carolina, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and other colonies the measure ordered the arrest and punishment of anyone helping citizens to depart, as well as anyone reentering the country. Those who left after March 22 were to be denied future inheritances. Emigrants could not be given any of their inheritances in advance, and secret departures were to be prevented. Though these policies were reaffirmed during the next few years and though this decree was repeated in 1771 its provisions were fruitless.² It failed to check secret exodus. Even the provision against return to Basel was set aside in the cases of poor emigrants on record as leaving in 1771-72. Paupers unable to continue their journey were allowed to make special applications for readmission to the canton and were accepted.³

Lists of those who left or intended to leave the Basel region for America in the early months of 1803 total 526 persons.⁴ The next great emigration was that following the Napoleonic wars and the famine of 1816. Basel in 1816-17 particularly opposed the emigration of paupers as they gathered at the seaports and caused complaints from Holland. Otherwise her attitude was the same as in the preceding century.⁵

Space does not permit discussion of the attitude of other Swiss cantons which sent emigrants to America but in smaller numbers. Their policies have been amply illustrated by the three major cantons whose viewpoints have been given above.⁶

Only little financial help was extended to subjects to keep them from emigrating. Elisabeth Charlotte of Orleans wrote in 1709 that she was glad that the Electoral Prince of the Palatinate had resolved to treat his poor subjects better; she

¹The decree is given in German in Faust, AHR, XXII, 128-30. Faust in his article in ibid., p. 31, speaks of its renewal in 1771, and in his Guide, pp. 104, 109 gives the date as March 25, 1771. It was particularly severe against agents collecting inheritances for Basel emigrants in America.

²Faust, Guide, pp. 105, 106, 107, 112.

³Faust, Lists, II, 174; Faust, Guide, pp. 107, 109, 113. The government, however, did not oppose emigration at this time.

⁴Faust, Guide, p. 114.

⁵Ibid., pp. 108, 115.

⁶The matter may be followed from Faust's references in ibid.

indicates that many who had been departing for Pennsylvania were already returning.¹ In this year some persons who had intended to go on to Pennsylvania settled at Alzei, where they had been released from taxes for the current year.²

Prince Wilhelm of Nassau-Dillenburg also attempted various reforms in his state in 1709 to prevent abuses which were causing emigration. Because of the wars he had remitted or relaxed taxes, had destroyed game which were harming the peasants' crops, and had granted alms and aid to the poor. Because war taxes and other burdens had helped promote the emigration fever, he promised that they would be lightened. Many superfluous and corrupt officials were dismissed and officers retained were warned of their duty to the state.³ This order accomplished nothing, and the emigration fever increased.⁴ Wilhelm was more severe in his emigration decree of August, 1709, because he felt that subjects who emigrated secretly were not thankful for what he had done to alleviate their distresses.⁵

In 1789 Nassau-Dillenburg was able to induce an emigrant and his children to remain home by promising an advance payment on his charcoal, because otherwise he could not support himself through the winter.⁶

A few attempts were made to restrict emigration in Switzerland by extending aid to poor subjects. In her warning against the departure of poor citizens from the Oberland in 1710-11, Bern gave assurances of help.⁷ In 1734 a good singer

¹Letter to Louise, Versailles, June 8, 1709. Given in German in Elisabeth Charlotte, Briefe der Herzogin Elisabeth Charlotte von Orleans, William L. Holland, ed., in Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart (Tübingen, 1871), CVII, 106-07. What his reforms were the letter does not say.

²Paper addressed to Regierungsrat-Präsidenten Freiherrn von Hollesheim, Heidelberg, July 30, 1709, and order for tax release of August 8, 1709. Both cited in Learned, Guide, p. 234.

³Copy of a decree of Wilhelm of Nassau-Dillenburg, July 17, 1709, in Goebel, DAG, XII (1912), pp. 145-46.

⁴Ibid., p. 127. ⁵Gerber, Nassau-Dill. Ausw., p. 7.

⁶R. 206, Vol. VII, Pt. II, pp. 144-49. It is not certain, however, whether Johannes Orttman stayed home or emigrated.

⁷Faust, Guide, p. 41.

was prevented from going from Zurich to Carolina by the offer of a position as schoolmaster.¹ In 1742 some Bernese highlanders were diverted from emigration by proposals of work in the French part of the canton, others were promised employment on the land.² At the same time emigration was strictly forbidden. The Commercial Council discussed the problem of how to improve the condition of the poor people in the Oberland, and in 1744 advised the establishment of a workhouse and of manufactures. The use of the undivided lands and of the forests was suggested for the hopelessly poor. Suggestions were made to use would-be emigrants in various industries, but few of the plans were ever attempted and those that were undertaken soon failed.³

A pastor in Zurich canton stated in 1744 that more than the paternal care of the government was needed to prevent emigration. He suggested sufficient work to provide industrious people a livelihood, but made no further suggestions.⁴ Another pastor in the canton in 1744 aided the poor of his parish in various ways, "For if despair once adopts another road, conditions would be very bad, because God's severe judgment is to be feared."⁵ The crux of the difficulty lay in the problem of providing the poor with sufficient work and sustenance, but the task was one incapable of solution by the minds of that day, as perhaps it is by our own generation.

This failure to deal with the fundamental causes of emigration made restrictive efforts in the main a failure. Abbé Raynal pointed out that the oppression of governments and bad economic conditions drove people to emigrate, and that it was

¹Ibid., pp. 18, 19.

²Faust, AHR, XXII, 29; Faust, Guide, p. 47.

³The matter has been briefly discussed in E. Lerch, Die Bernische Auswanderung, a separate print from the Blätter für Bernische Geschichte, Kunst, und Altertumskunde, Jahrgang V, Heft 4, Dec. 1909, pp. 19-31, but neither of these have been available to the writer. See Faust, AHR, XXII, 32, and Faust, Guide, pp. 36, 47, 55.

⁴Report from Dättlikon parish, March 27, 1744, in Faust, Lists, I, 43, and plate 1, frontispiece.

⁵Report of Pastor Caspar Brunner, Trüllikon parish, April 25, 1744, in ibid., I, 88-89.

futile to try to retain them by force; only milder means and better expectations at home could restrain them.¹ Even in cases where restrictive decrees are referred to as being effective, no mention is made of the influence of factors like war and peace, famine, or the fact that the stream may have already passed its flood stage.² In 1685 a prominent French official saw that, despite all the stringent restrictive measures of Louis XIV, it was impossible to prevent departures where subjects were determined to leave.³ Printed words of warning,⁴ the efforts of local pastors,⁵ and persuasion of government officials⁶ were futile, and new restrictive decrees only exasperated subjects and heightened their desire to go.⁷ A Württemberg report stated:

No remonstrance helps to check such people from departure who are once infatuated by the better circumstances of the American Islands, and nothing that is pointed out to them about the condition of these provinces and the difficulties and dangers of the voyage is able to change in the least anything that believers have received in a letter from there.⁸

¹Abbé Raynal, History of the Settlements and Trade of the Europeans in the East and West Indies (London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1783), VII, 411.

²Württemberg emigration was small in 1768 and German emigration to America was almost checked in 1789. We doubt, however, that restrictive legislation was responsible in either case. Learned, Guide, p. 304; letter of Phineas Bond, Philadelphia, November 10, 1789, in Amer. Hist. Association, Annual Report, 1896, I, 643.

³Dispatch of M. de Bonrepas to Marquis de Seignelay, London, December 31, 1685. Quoted in Weiss, Fr. Prot. Refugees, II, 399-400.

⁴Faust, Guide, p. 47.

⁵See the letter of pastor Johan Friderich Wettstein, Langenbrückh, Basel canton, March 1, 1736. In Faust, DAG, XVIII, 12.

⁶See, for example, the examinations of Swiss emigrants in 1642, given in ibid., 15-17, and in Faust, AHR, XXII, 106-08.

⁷Report of Deputies for Rural Affairs, Basel, March 14, 1750. In Faust, DAG, XVIII, 28.

⁸Report of the Balinger Vogts Venninger, August 31, 1713 (?), quoted in Gerber, Beiträge, p. 2.

